

Jeffery Eugene Jeter #131471
Lee Correctional Institution
990 Wisacky Highway
Bishopville, South Carolina
29010-1775

RECEIVED

SEP 25 2013

PRO SE PETITIONER

S.C. SUPREME COURT

SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT
CLERK OF COURTS OFFICE
Daniel E. Shearouse, Clerk
Post Office Box 11330
Columbia, South Carolina
29010-1775

RE: Jeter v. State, #2013-000215

Dear Clerk,
Find enclosed for filing:

- (1). Petitioner's pro se Response to Johnson Petition
For Writ of Certiorari;
- (2). Exhibit (A) & (B); and (C) + (D)
- (3). Proof of Service.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

September 20, 2013

Respectfully Submitted,

rds/JET

JE
Jeffery Eugene Jeter #131471

cc: FILE
CLERK
WHITE
PACHAK

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM SPARTANBURG COUNTY
In The Court of Common Pleas

J. Mark Hayes, II, Circuit Court Judge

APPELLATE CASE NO. 2013-000215

Jeffery Eugene Jeter Petitioner,

vs.

State of South Carolina Respondents.

PETITIONER'S PRO SE RESPONSE TO JOHNSON
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

RECEIVED

SEP 25 2013

S.C. SUPREME COURT

Jeffery Eugene Jeter #131471
Lee Correctional Institution
990 Wisacky Highway
Bishopville, South Carolina
29010- 1775

PRO SE PETITIONER

INDEX

Index	1
Issues Presented	2
Statement of Facts	3
Argument (1)	4
Argument (2)	12
Conclusion	19

ISSUES PRESENTED

(1). WHETHER PLEA COUNSEL WAS INEFFECTIVE BECAUSE HE WAS OPERATING UNDER A CONFLICT OF INTEREST, WHO WAS A VICTIM, AND MULTIPLE REPRESENTATIONS OF CO-DEFENDANTS?

(2). WHETHER PLEA COUNSEL WAS INEFFECTIVE FOR FAILING TO OBJECT AND MOVE THE TRIAL COURT TO ENFORCE THE TERMS AND STIPULATIONS USED TO INDUCE PETITIONER INTO ENTERING THE PLEA?

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On October 28, 2010, Petitioner appeared before the Honorable Roger L. Couch, Circuit Court Judge, in the Court of Common Pleas for Spartanburg County, pled guilty and was sentenced to [four], ten-year consecutive terms of imprisonment. James Cheek, Esquire, of the Public Defenders Office represented Petitioner during these proceedings.

On December 17, 2010, a hearing was conducted as to the merits of a motion for reconsideration. This motion was denied.

On May 2, 2011, Petitioner filed an Application for post-Conviction Relief (PCR). On May 2, 2012, Respondents filed their return. On November 9, 2012, an evidentiary hearing was held before the Honorable J. Mark Hayes, II, Circuit Court Judge. Petitioner was represented by Chris Bonds, Esquire; and Respondents were represented by Suzanne White, Esquire, Assistant Attorney General. Testifying during this hearing were Petitioner, plea counsel, and Ryan Sauers of the South Carolina Department of Corrections.

On January 16, 2013, Judge Hayes issued an Order, denying Petitioner relief. This Petition follows:

WHETHER PLEA COUNSEL WAS INEFFECTIVE BECAUSE HE WAS OPERATING UNDER A CONFLICT OF INTEREST, WHO WAS A VICTIM, AND MULTIPLE REPRESENTATIONS OF CO_DEFENDANTS?

"The Sixth Amendment right to counsel attaches upon initiation of adversarial judicial proceedings and at all critical stages of a criminal trial." State v. Sterling, 377 S.C. 475, 479, 661 S.E.2d 99, 101 (2008). "To establish a violation to the Sixth Amendment right to effective assistance of counsel due to a conflict of interest arising from multiple representations, a defendant who did not object at trial must show an actual conflict of interest adversely affected his attorney's performance. An actual conflict of interests occurs where an attorney owes a duty to a party whose interests are adverse to the defendant's. Staggs v. State, 372 S.C. 549, 551, 643 S.E.2d 690, 692 (2007).

"Rules governing a lawyer's conduct whenever an actual or potential conflict of interest arises protect at least three interests. First, they reduce the likelihood of a lawyer improperly disclosing confidential information; second, they protect against a lawyer being placed in a position in which competing loyalties or responsibilities may cause the lawyer to represent the client with less than full vigor; and third, they

preserve a client's reasonable expectations of loyalty arising out of the attorney-client relationship." United States v. Nicholson, 475 F.3d 241 (4th Cir. 2007); see generally John Freeman, Conflicts of Interest: Multiple Ways To Lose, S.C., Mar.-Apr., at 11 (1996).

This State's Supreme Court has defined a conflict of interest as: "when a defense attorney places himself in a situation inherently conducive to divided loyalties ... if a defense attorney owes a duty to a party whose interests are adverse to those of the defendant, then an actual conflict of interest exists. The interests of the other client and the defendant are sufficiently adverse if it is shown that the attorney owes a duty to the defendant to take some action that could be detrimental to his other client." Duncan v. State, 281 S.C. 435, 438, 315 S.E.2d 809, 811 (1984)(quoting Zuck v. State of Alabama, 588 F.2d 436, 439 (5th Cir. 1979)). And there need not be a prejudice demonstration if an actual conflict of interest has been established. State v. Gregory, 364 S.C. 150, 153, 612 S.E.2d 449, 450 (2005). Furthermore, a defendant must show that an actual conflict of interest, or counsel represented a conflict of interest to establish ineffective assistance of counsel. Duncan, 281 S.C. at 438, 315 S.E.2d at 811 (quoting Cuyler v. Sullivan, 446 U.S. 335, 350 (1980)).

The matter before this Court today is one which presents a claim that the pcr court erred in finding that trial

counsel did not represent an actual conflict of interest, during the various representations of this case.

When before the trial court, trial counsel informed the court that he had deep rooted ties to the Spartanburg Memorial Committee ("victim"), where he had initially represented and assisted in the original project. (Appendix p. 28, l. 9; and Appendix p. 28, ll. 11-19). Petitioner was of a stance and belief that the representation of this trial counsel would greatly disadvantage his opportunity to a fundamentally fair and impartial proceeding, as well as representation; that Petitioner contacted the Clerk of Courts Office, (Appendix p. 28, ll. 16-19; Appendix p. 101, ll. 10-20), and Chief of the Public Defenders Office, complaining of the conflict of interest; requesting that another trial counsel be appointed to the criminal proceedings. (Appendix p. 145 and 146; Appendix p. 77, ll. 9-17). The pcr court found that there was no foul when a potential conflict of interest occurs.

Yet, looking at the circumstances of this case, it is evident by the facts and circumstances of this case that there existed multiple representations with the: (1) victim, i.e., Spartanburg Memorial Committe (Ms. Jefferies, Treasurer); (2) Sharon Thomas (co-defendant); and (3) Wanda Poole (co-defendant). Trial counsel represented not only the victim in this case, but, [two] of the co-defendants, plus did not pursue criminal proceedings against the Treasurers grandson. This Petitioner is of the belief and stance that, of all the individuals whom were

associated with these criminal activities, whether it be relatives/victims/co-defendants, trial counsel failed to represent this client's rights and it is evident by the facts of this case.

In furtherance of this Petitioner's stance in this matter, the Court must realize and take note that, no where in any proceedings, or records thereof, is there any form of waiver as to the issue of the actual conflict of interest. At no time did the trial court, conduct a colloquy, with this Petitioner, as to whether Petitioner waived the conflict of interest. Furthermore, it was not discovered by Petitioner until prior to the pcr proceedings, that trial counsel represented both of the co-defendants in this case. For there to be a valid waiver to a conflict of interest, it must not only be voluntary, but it must be done knowingly and intelligently. United States v. Swartz, 975 F.2d 1042, 1048-49 (4th Cir. 1992); and Hoffman v. Leeke, 903 F.2d 280, 289 (4th Cir. 1990). Petitioner is of the belief that, if there had of existed a waiver, which there was not, it would not have been knowing, intelligent or voluntary because, Petitioner was not aware of the multiple representations of his co-defendants. Swartz, 975 F.2d at 1049-50; Hoffman, 903 F.2d at 289 (Hoffman's waiver not intelligent "because Hoffman could not waive what he did not know.")

In Thomas v. State, 346 S.C. 140, 143-45, 551 S.E.2d 254, 256 (2001), this Court held that, the Applicant in the pcr proceeding demonstrated an actual conflict of interest that

affected Thomas's counsels performance given that, Thomas's counsel represented Thomas and her Husband in a case where the solicitor offered a plea bargain that would allow the charge against one spouse to be dismissed if the other spouse would plead guilty to the entire amount of cocaine.

In Staggs v. State, 372 S.E.2d 549, 643 S.E.2d 690 (2007), during a pcr proceeding Staggs demonstrated that an actual conflict of interest had existed and adversely affected his trial counsel's performance where his counsel, who represented Staggs father, mother, and brother on related accessory after the fact of murder charges, was ineffective for the multiple representations. **See generally** Allan L. Schwartz, Circumstances Giving Rise to Conflict of Interest Between or Among Criminal Defendants Precluding Representation by Same Counsel, 34 A.L.R.3d 470 (1970 & 2008 Supp.).

In Lomax v. State, 379 S.C. 93, 665 S.E.2d 164 (2008), this Court examined an actual conflict of interest where trial counsel represented Lomax and her husband. During the plea, her Husband was sentenced to three years, where trial counsel had argued for his leniency. This Court found in Lomax that the pcr court erred in finding that Lomax was not prejudiced by trial counsels performance. Yet, this Court held that once a conflict of interest was established, prejudice was not a necessary element for the court to reverse.

The record before this Court is replete with trial counsel's admissions of the multiple representation relating to this case. Trial counsel was aware of the dangers in which occur during these types of representations. Why else would trial counsel warn or inform this Petitioner of the conflict of interest, prior to the representation in the guilty plea? After that Petitioner did all within his limited power to correct the actual conflict of interest. (See attached hereto, a copy of Exhibit (A), dated September 13, 2010)(Appendix p. 77, ll. 9-11).

Petitioner would argue that, during the course of the multiple representations, and proceedings, the record demonstrates that trial counsel assisted [both] co-defendants with a sentence of five-year with 5-years probation, and the other with a sentence of two-years and five-years probation. Edgemon v. State, 318 S.C. 3, 455 S.E.2d 500 (1995)(actual conflict of interest where counsel convinced solicitor co-defendant's were less culpable). This Court must take notice that this Petitioner was sentenced to a forty-year term of imprisonment with five-years probation to be served after service of the forty-year sentence. All offenses that were pled to were non-violent, and basically considered white collar.

Also, during the pcr proceedings a witness was called to offer testimony concerning a conversation that he had been privy to when transporting Petitioner to court. Trial counsel happen to be at the holding cell and confronted Petitioner. A

heated argument ensued and this neutral individual was summoned to testify.

Ryan Sauers is an employee of the South Carolina Department of Corrections, assigned to the transportation department of the Lee Correctional Institution. He testified that trial counsel, boldly, admitted to selling this Petitioner "down the river". (Appendix p. 18, ll. 11-25; Appendix p. 119, ll. 1-25; Appendix p. 120, ll. 1-20). Whether the statement made by trial counsel was, in fact, words spoken in anger ... it has been Petitioner's understanding that when words are spoken in anger, they are spoken by an honest thought and mind.

Petitioner is of the belief that trial counsel's performance was deficient where he secured lesser sentences for two co-defendants and caused the impression of Petitioner being the initiator or master mind behind this criminal activity; allowed the Treasurer's grandson to not be prosecuted, where there was over whelming evidence of the grandson's guilt and culpability, (See Exhibit (B), dated June 8, 2008, attached hereto and incorporated herewith); and represented the victim and co-defendants. This demonstrated that there was sufficient evidence establishing the actual existence of a conflict of interest.

Petitioner believes that trial counsel was ineffective during his performance due to the multiple conflicts of interest that existed, and the pcr court erred in not finding trial

counsel ineffective. Petitioner would respectfully demand that the pcr court's decision be reversed, and this case remanded for a new trial consistent with this Court's decision.

WHETHER PLEA COUNSEL WAS INEFFECTIVE FOR FAILING TO OBJECT AND MOVE THE TRIAL COURT TO ENFORCE THE TERMS AND STIPULATIONS USED TO INDUCE PETITIONER INTO ENTERING THE PLEA?

In Santobello v. New York, 404 U.S. 257, 92 S.Ct. 495, 30 L.Ed.2d 427 (1971), an assistant district attorney promised a criminal defendant that a sentencing recommendation would not be made if he pled guilty to a lesser offense; the defendant agreed. At sentencing another assistant district attorney made a sentencing recommendation because of his ignorance regarding the prior promise. The United States Supreme Court (USSC) ruled that it was error for the lower court to accepted his plea. Id., at 262-63, 92 S.Ct. at 499. The USSC held that plea bargains were an efficient method to administer justice, but that the process must be safeguarded to ensure the fairness that the process presupposes. Id., at 261, 92 S.Ct. at 498. The Santobello Court held: "When a plea rests in any significant degree on a promise or agreement of the prosecutor, so that it can be said to be part of the inducement such promise must be fulfilled." Id., at 262, 92 S.Ct. at 499.

In United States v. Ringling, the Fourth Court of Appeals held, "Plea bargains rest on contractual principles, and each party should receive the benefits of its bargain. Yet, the analysis of the plea agreement must be conducted at a more

stringent level than in a commercial contract because of the rights involved are generally fundamentally and constitutionally based."

In United States v. Harvey, 791 F.2d 294 (4th Cir. 1986), the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals held that when interpreting a plea agreement, "both constitutional and supervisory concerns require holding the government to a greater responsibility than the defendant (or possibility would be either of the parties to a commercial contract) for imprecisions or ambiguities in a plea agreement." Id., at 300.

In Alexander v. State, 303 S.C. 539, 402 S.E.2d 414 (1991), plea counsel was found ineffective, and the plea entered involuntarily, for a fifteen (15) year sentence; where counsel testified that Alexander faced a potential 100-year or life without parole sentence when Alexander actually faced a possible maximum of 75-years without parole in all charged offenses. The charges overlapped and Alexander would have received, at most, twenty-five (25) years on each of the two charges. It was the Court's decision that "because trial counsel's improper sentencing advice induced petitioner's guilty plea, the case had to be reversed. See Hinson v. State, 297 S.C. 456, 377 S.E.2d 338 (1989)(new trial granted where incorrect parole eligibility advice induced plea).

In Custodio v. State, Opinion No. #26296 (S.C.Sup.Ct. filed March 26, 2007), petitioner agreed to enter a plea for a cap

of fifteen (15) years. Custodio was sentenced to thirty (30) years. The pcr court found that there was no evidence in which to substantiate that Custodio had in fact been promised the negotiated cap. It was Custodio's position that his plea counsel was ineffective for failing to seek specific performance of the plea agreement, based upon the Court of Appeals decision in Reed v. Becka, 333 S.C. 676, 511 S.E.2d 396 (Ct.App. 1999).

In Reed, the solicitor made an oral offer, which Becka accepted, to allow Becka to plea to a lesser offense with a recommendation of probation. However, after the State consulted with the victim's family, the State withdrew the plea offer. The trial judge found the offer was valid and denied the State's motion to withdraw. The Court of Appeals reversed.

The Reed Court held that a defendant does not have a constitutional right to plea bargain, a trial judge is not required to accept a plea bargain, and that ordinarily a plea offer is nothing more than an offer, until it is accepted by the defendant by entering a court-approved plea of guilty. However, the Reed Court found the general rule is subject to a detrimental reliance exception, which is stated as: "Absent an actual plea of guilty, a defendant may enforce an oral plea agreement only upon a showing of detrimental reliance on a prosecutorial promise in plea bargaining. Reed, 333 S.C. at 688, 511 S.E.2d at 402, also State v. Peake, 345 S.C. 72, 545 S.E.2d 840 (Ct.App.

2001)(enforcement of an agreement not to prosecute is subject to two conditions: (1) the agent must be authorized to make the promise; and (2) the defendant must rely to his detriment on the promise).

Even if the agreement has not been formalized by the court, a defendant's detrimental reliance on a prosecutorial promise in plea bargaining may make the plea agreement binding. Reed, 333 S.C. at 688, 511 S.E.2d at 402-03.

The Reed Court further adopted a rule that the State may withdraw a plea bargain offer before a defendant pleads guilty, provided the defendant has not detrimentally relied on the offer. But, the court cannot withdraw after, the actual entry of the guilty plea by defendant or any other change of position by him constituting detrimental reliance upon the arrangement. Detrimental reliance may be demonstrated where the defendant performed some part of the bargain.

This exception applies to this current circumstance where this Petitioner accepted a plea with a recommendation of five (5) years, all sentences to run concurrently and five (5) years probation. The plea agreement went as follows:

SOLICITOR KENDALL: --- is that Mr. Jeter pleads to five counts of forgery and two counts of petty larceny to run concurrently with each other and with his probation violation for -- additionally that Mr. Jeter plead to one count of obtaining goods by false pretenses, and two counts of receiving stolen

goods with a recommendation of a consecutive term of ten years suspended to five years of probation with restitution. The remaining three charges will be dismissed in this incident, Your Honor.

(Appendix p.17, ll. 6-14).

As the record reflects, the trial court became distorted as to the specific terms that induced this Petitioner to enter a plea under the agreed upon conditions. (Appendix p. 17, l. 15). Yet, the recommendation was addressed as to the specific terms that Petitioner would enter the plea of guilt upon. (Appendix p. 17, ll. 20-25; Appendix p. 18, ll. 1-17). The exact terms which the plea was based upon were outlined in the record now before this Court. And looking at the manner in which the solicitor placed the terms and stipulations upon the record, it was the trial court's duty and obligation, *sua sponte*, to decline all of the plea agreement or to accept the plea agreement. Trial counsel never objected to the trial court's failure to maintain the terms and conditions which induced this Petitioner to enter the plea, and waive his Constitutional rights.

Although the trial court addressed the issue that it could impose a 130-year sentence upon Petitioner, that was something that trial counsel specifically stated would never

happen. That this judge would honor the terms of the agreement. It was the only reason that Petitioner entered the guilty plea. Had he of known that the trial court would not accept the agreement, as placed upon the record, Petitioner would have demanded to pursue his right to confront witnesses, testify and have a jury of his peers decided his fate. Yet, when the trial court imposed the sentence of forty-years, excessively beyond the terms specified in the record and agreement which induced his guilty plea, such made his plea unknowingly and unintelligently entered. It was not foreseeable for this Petitioner to have known that the government would not abide by its own agreement. Petitioner agreed to accept one punishment and received a greater one contrary to the stipulations and terms that caused him to enter the plea.

Petitioner is of the belief that he formed a contract with the prosecutor, and thereby was due a due process right to have all stipulations and terms enforced. It is true that the trial court does not have to accept a plea bargain, but, once it accepts the plea, Petitioner believes that the terms must be adhered to. Justice would demand that the terms and stipulations are binding upon all parties, once the plea is entered and accepted. It is evident that the protections due under due process has fallen extremely short in this case.

Petitioner would argue that, the failure to abide by

those terms addressed, specifically within the trial transcript has deprived him the opportunity to have his right to a knowingly and intelligently waiver of rights. This has caused the criminal proceeding to be tainted.

Petitioner would respectfully demand that this Court find that trial counsel was ineffective where he failed to enforce, or object, to the sentence imposed due to it far exceeding the terms agreed upon to induce, or detrimentally relied upon, thereby invading the mutually agreed upon terms, causing Petitioner to waive his fundamental constitutional right. This matter should be reversed and remanded to the Court of General Sessions for new trial.

CONCLUSION

Petitioner would respectfully move this Court to find trial counsel ineffective for not recusing himself due to multiple conflicts of interest; and, for failing to object or enforce the terms and stipulations of the plea agreement.

September 20, 2013

Respectfully Submitted,

Jeffery Jeter

Jeffery Eugene Jeter #131471
Lee Correctional Institution
990 Wisacky Highway
Bishopville, South Carolina
29010-1775

PRO SE PETITIONER

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM SPARTANBURG COUNTY
In The Court of Common Pleas

J. Mark Hayes, II, Circuit Court Judge

Jeffery Eugene Jeter Petitioner,

vs.

State of South Carolina Respondents.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the: (1) Petitioner's pro
se Response to Johnson Petitioner For Writ of Certiorari; (2)
Exhibit (A) & (B); and (3) Proof of Service, by depositing a copy
of the same in the United States Mail, First Class postage
affixed thereon, addressed as follows:


SOUTH CAROLINA ATTORNEY GENERALS OFFICE
Suzanne White, Esquire
Assistant Attorney General
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, South Carolina
29211-1549;

SOUTH CAROLINA SUPREME COURT
CLERK OF COURTS OFFICE
Daniel E. Shearouse, Clerk
Post Office Box 11330
Columbia, South Carolina
29211-1330; and

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON INDIGENT DEFENSE
DIVISION OF APPELLATE DEFENSE
Robert M. Pachak, Esquire
Assistant Appellate Defender
Post Office Box 11589
Columbia, South Carolina
29211-1589.

September 26, 2013

respectfully Submitted,



Jeffery Eugene Jeter #131471
Lee Correctional Institution
990 Wisacky Highway
Bishopville, South Carolina
29010-1775

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
ST. LOUIS COUNTY

Date 9/13/10

2010 SEP 15 PM 3:40

M. HOPE BLACKLEY

M. Blackley

Back in May of 09 I wrote to the Clerk of Court asking for a change of venue. Due to the fact that with all the foreign charges that I have the people who the checks belong to same check has ties with he help start the company so. This for it was a conflict of interest for him to even try to plea my case for me which he did. He went to the D.A's office and talk to the D.A. in my case then when I did not want to do what they asked. He start telling me that he hope that they give me the max on all my charges. Because I wrote check off the company he help get started. I don't think that I will get a fair trial seeing that the D.A's office and know what Mr. Check want. Then they put Andrea price on my case which I know that he and Mr. Check works out of the same office. She told me that she goes to all my vol's calls that I did not have to be there. And she never notified me of a bond hearing on 6/23/10 now I am back in jail on new bench warrants. If at all possible I would like to request a pro/bono lawyer in my case. Ask a change of venue because?

EXHIBIT (A)

T

39-1413 05

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG)

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

WARRANT NUMBER(S): M111661; M180192; M180193
M180200; M180201; M181350; M181352; M181939;
M181940

The State of South Carolina,)
)
Vs.)
)
Jeffrey Eugene Jeter,)
)
Defendant.)

SOLICITOR'S AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

PERSONALLY appeared before me the undersigned deponent, who being duly sworn, says that he/she served the following materials:

- 1. _____ Incident report
- 2. _____ Detective notes
- 3. _____ Defendants written statement
- 4. _____ SLED reports
- 5. _____ Co-Def. Statement
- 6. _____ Rap Sheet
- 7. _____ Sol. Rule 5 Request
- 8. _____ Audio/Video Tape
- 9. _____ Other- **Notice of Motion and Motion to Revoke Bond**

in this action on **ARTHUR L. MOORE, BONDSMAN;**

by delivering _____ personally.

by delivering _____, a person of age and discretion residing at the residence of the defendant and being at said residence at the time of service

by delivering to Arthur Moore at the place of business MailBox

and leaving with him/her copies of the same at 580 S. Center St., Spartanburg, South Carolina, on the 17th day of JUNE, 2010, and that the deponent is not a party to this action and has no interest therein or connection therewith.

Investigator
Seventh Judicial Circuit
Office of the Solicitor

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY
2010 JUN 22 PM 4:36
M. JOPE BLACKLEY

SWORN to before me this 17th
day of June, 2010.

Rebena L. Ray
Notary Public for South Carolina

My Commission expires: 12-13-10

don't think I am being treated fair by the
P. D. office and the P. A.'s office. Ms. Blackley
will you please look in to this matter. Because there is
A conflict of Interest in my case Thank you for
your time in this matter

Contact Clay Allen at Juffen Eugene Jett
the Public Defenders
office and inform him
of this issue.

J. Camp

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
2010 SEP 15 PM 3:40
M. HOPE BLACKLEY

INCIDENT REPORT

INCIDENT TYPE	COMPLETED	FORCED ENTRY	PREMISE TYPE	UNITS ENTERED	TYPE VICTIM
1. 16-13-0030(A) Larceny/Petit or Simple Larceny 23H ALL OTHER LARCENY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	RESIDENCE/HOME		<input type="checkbox"/> Individual <input type="checkbox"/> Business <input type="checkbox"/> Financial Inst <input type="checkbox"/> Government <input type="checkbox"/> Relig. Orgn. <input type="checkbox"/> Soc./Public <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Police Off.
2.	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO			
3.	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO			

INCIDENT LOCATION (SUBDIVISION, APARTMENT AND NUMBER, STREET NAME AND NUMBER) 172 COLLINS AVE, SPARTANBURG, SC ZIP CODE 29306- WEAPON TYPE

INCIDENT DATE	24 HR. CLOCK	TO	DATE	24 HR. CLOCK	DISPATCH DATE/TIME 24 HR. CLOCK	DISPATCH DATE/TIME 24 HR. CLOCK	DISPATCH DATE/TIME 24 HR. CLOCK	LOCATION NO.
06/01/2008	08:00		07/01/2008	16:00			16:00	3

COMPLAINANT'S NAME (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)	RELATIONSHIP TO SUBJECT	RESIDENT	RACE	SEX	AGE	ETH	DAYTIME PHONE	EVENING PHONE
JEFFERIES, RUTH	#1 #2 #3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	B	F	80 /	N	664-583-8551	

ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE	LOCATION NO.
172 COLLINS AVE	SPARTANBURG	SC		

VICTIM'S NAME (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)	RELATIONSHIP TO SUBJECT	RESIDENT	RACE	SEX	AGE	ETH	DAYTIME PHONE	EVENING PHONE
SPARTANBURG COMMUNITY MEMORIAL COMM	#1 #2 #3	<input type="checkbox"/>			/			

HEIGHT WEIGHT HAIR EYES FACIAL HAIR, SCARS, TATTOOS, GLASSES, CLOTHING, PHYSICAL PECULIARITIES, ETC.

ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE	LOCATION NO.
172 COLLINS AVE	SPARTANBURG	SC	29306-	

VS BLENDURY (MCT.1) YES NO EXPLAIN- COMPLAINT OF ANY NON-VS BLENDURES YES NO

VICTIM(S) USING: ALCOHOL YES NO UNK. DRUGS: YES NO UNK. TYPE:

TWO MAN VEH: ONE MAN VEH: DETECTIVE SPASMT. OTHER: ALONE: ASSISTED: *J-This Jurisdiction. S-State. O-Out of State. U-Unknown.

SUSPECT	NAME (LAST, FIRST, MIDDLE)	RACE	SEX	AGE	ETH	DATE OF BIRTH	HEIGHT	WEIGHT	HAIR	EYES
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	THOMAS, SHARON, DENISE	B	F	33 /	N	12/13/1974	506	200	BLACK	BROWN

RUNAWAY FACIAL HAIR, SCARS, TATTOOS, GLASSES, CLOTHING, PHYSICAL PECULIARITIES, ETC. DAYTIME PHONE 864-809-1925 EVENING PHONE

WARRANT	ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIP CODE	LOCATION NO.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	120 TYLER CT	SPARTANBURG	SC	29301-	

JAIL	SUBJECT(S) USING ALCOHOL <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> UNK. <input type="checkbox"/>	ARRESTED NEAR OFFENSE SCENE <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	DATE/TIME OF OFFENSE	DATE/TIME OF ARREST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			06/01/2008 8:00:00 AM	

SUMMONS	DRUGS <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> UNK. <input type="checkbox"/> TYPE	TOTAL # ARRESTED	DAY OF THE WEEK	HOW REPORTED	A= OFFICER DISPATCHED ON CALL	D= COMPLAINT WRITTEN IN	DIFF. FACTOR	A= RESISTANCE/HOSTILITY	E= COMPLAINANT FREQUENTLY INTOXICATED
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>									

ORIGINAL - BRADLEY, T.L.

ON 7/10/2008 AT 1600 HRS I INV BRADLEY SPOKE TO MS JEFFERIES AT CITY HALL WHO FILED A POLICE REPORT FOR LARCENY AND FORGERY. MS JEFFERIES STATED THAT SHE IS THE TREASURER FOR THE SPARTANBURG COMMUNITY MEMORIAL COMMITTEE AND THAT SHE KEEPS THE CHECKBOOK AT HER RESIDENCE IN A WOODEN LOCK BOX. MS JEFFERIES STATED SHE DISCOVERED CHECKS MISSING FROM THE CHECKBOOK AND OBTAINED COPIES OF THE CHECKS FROM THE BANK THAT SHE DID NOT SIGN. MS JEFFERIES STATED THAT NO SIGNS OF FORCIBLE ENTRY TO HER RESIDENCE AND NOTHING ELSE MISSING. MS JEFFERIES STATED THAT HER GRANDSON IS THE ONLY PERSON IN THE HOUSE. I INV BRADLEY WILL FOLLOW UP ON CASE.

JURISDICTION OF THEFT LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY	JURISDICTION OF RECOVERY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY
SC0420100	

TYPE (GROUP)	22	TOTAL VALUE
STOLEN	0	0
DAMAGED	0	0
BURNED	0	0
RECOVERED	0	0
SEIZED	0	0

SUBJECT IDENTIFIED	SUBJECT LOCATED	S. F.	ACTIVE	ADM. CLOSED	ARRESTED UNDER 18	EX-CLEAR UNDER 18
<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		<input type="checkbox"/> UNFOUNDED	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> ARRESTED 18 AND OVER	<input type="checkbox"/> EX-CLEAR 18 AND OVER

REASON FOR EXCEPTIONAL CLEARANCE: 1. OFFENDER DEATH 2. NO PROSECUTION 3. EXTRAJURISDICTION DENIED 4. VICTIM DECLINES COOPERATION 5. JUVENILE IN CUSTODY.

REPORTING OFFICER(S)	DATE	UNIT NUMBER	APPROVING OFFICER	DATE	UNIT NUMBER
BRADLEY, T.L.	07/10/2008 4:00:00	0042			

FOLLOWUP INVESTIGATION YES NO

Check list for Requesting Bench Warrants

✓ Was Respondent Personally Served

✓ File Has Been Pulled and Reviewed

✓ Remark Screen Has Been Reviewed

✓ Most Current Address Has Been Verified

Order for Requesting Bench Warrant Has Been Prepared For Signature

Judge Signed Order Requesting Bench Warrant on 7-8-10

Bench Warrant Has Been Printed and Place in Pick-up Tray for Sherriff's Office

Date:

7-8-10

By:

Cindy James

Bench Warrant Form Completed, If Needed

November 8, 2010

09-1414

M. Hope Blackley
Clerk of Court
Spartanburg County
P.O. Box 3843
Spartanburg, S.C. 29304

RE: Motion for Re-sentencing
Honorable Judge Cowik

Dear Ms. Blackley:

Please find enclosed a copy of my "Motion for Re-sentencing." I am currently being housed at the Kirieland Correctional Institution & E Center. I would greatly appreciate it if you would file this motion at your earliest convenience.

If you would file stamp this for me and return a copy to me I would be most grateful.

Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

~~/s/ Jeffrey Eugene~~
Jeffrey Eugene
-C1-317

Kirieland Corr. Inst. E C
4344 Broad River Rd
Columbia, SC 29204

1150
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY
2010 NOV 10 AM 10:55
M. HOPE BLACKLEY

EXHIBIT (C)

M

2009-GS-42-01414 Date 11/23/10

M/s. Blackley

I am starting to know which case will be resented, I sent in 2 motions of resending on 11/8/10 you clock stamp it as being recd on 11/10/10 so which case will be heard 2nd? These are the case numbers

2009 GS 1/201414
2009 GS 1/201415
2009 GS 1/201412

2009 GS 1/201414. I filed 2 motions on 11/8/10 I just need to know the status of it you stamp it so what's the status

M. HOPE BLACKLEY

2010 DEC -1 AM 11:55

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY

Stamp

I am requesting A CASE HISTORY

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
SEVENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT
COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG

The State,

vs.

Jeffrey Eugene Jeter,
Defendant.

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

Cs. No.'s: 2009GS4201414 - No

2009GS4201415 ✓

2009GS4201416 ✓

Motion for Re-sentencing

COMES NOW, Jeffrey Eugene Jeter ("Defendant"), acting as a pro se litigant interposing Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972), respectfully requesting that this Honorable Court construe this motion in a most liberal manner due to Defendant's lack of access to the Law Library, located at the Kirkland Corr. Inst. REC (KCI REC) center, where he is currently being housed. Due to having "no" access to the library Defendant wishes to make clear that he is pointing out an error to this Court in the calculation of the sentencing statute(s) and in seeking relief. If this motion fails, it is of the belief he can bring this motion up in later post conviction remedied. If this motion fails Defendant intends to pursue this issue through appeal so if this issue would be lost by failing this motion Defendant withdraws same. If the issue will not

be lost then Defendant requests that this motion be heard and ruled on at this Court's earliest possible convenience. Defendant offers the following facts in support, thereof:

I.

Defendant's cases were heard by the Honorable Judge Couch on October 28, 2010, in the Seventh Judicial Circuit General Sessions Court in the County of Spartanburg. The aforementioned cases were also adjudicated on this same day. The sentences received by Defendant were three (3) ten (10) year sentences to be served consecutively for the offense(s) of "Forgery/Forgery, value less than \$5000 (0-10 years) § 16-13-001(B). EXHIBIT 1. Defendant brings to the attention of this Court that this statute does not coincide with the appropriate sentence and is therefore a miscalculation and/or misinterpretation and must be corrected as a proper remedy.

II.

In the instant cases, the dollar amounts never extend beyond the \$5000 mark which would "trigger" the sentence Defendant received. It is explicitly stated in the S.C. Code of Laws, Title 16-13-10, Forgery, that Defendant may only receive five (5) year sentence for the crime(s) in which he participated and inevitably plead guilty. Instead of the "... in violation of § 16-13-001(B) entry in the

Sentencing Sheet, the entry should have read "...in violation of § 16-13-10(B)(2), which is the correct statute for "...this section is guilty of a: (2) felony, and upon conviction, must be fined in the discretion of the court or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both, if the amount of the forgery is less than five thousand dollars." See: EXHIBIT 2

Defendant explains that he has been sentenced under § 16-13-10(B)(1) "...if the amount of the forgery is five thousand dollars or more," and this renders his sentences "null and void" and they must be recalculated and he be sentenced to five (5) year terms instead of ten (10) year terms. EXHIBIT 2. Notwithstanding any other factors that have not been made clear on the Sentencing Sheet, re-sentencing is the "only" appropriate remedy. Defendant also respectfully requests that the corrected sentences be ordered to be served concurrently.

WHEREFORE Defendant prays that this motion be granted in its entirety correcting the erroneous sentence of ten (10) years and ordering the appropriate sentences of five (5) years per count and adding that these sentences also be served concurrently.

Signed this 8 Day of November, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,
By Jeffrey Eugene Jeter JUDGE # 131471
Jeffrey Eugene Jeter
FCI-31A
KCI REC
4344 Broad River road
Columbia, SC 29210

FILED
CLERK OF COURTS
PARTLAND COURTHOUSE
NOV 10 AM 10:06
M. HOPE BLACKBURN

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY

2012 JUL 30 PM 3:25

M. HOPE BLACKLEY

State of South Carolina
County of Spartanburg

Court of General Session

PCR

Jeffrey Jeter,

Amendment to PCR Application
and ~~Allegation~~ of Law

1) Prosecutorial Misconduct

At trial the prosecutor deliberately misrepresented the facts and evidence before the courts, in an attempt to deny applicant a fair opportunity to present his case before the courts. See transcript pg # 16, Lines 10, 13. Clearly there can be no dispute that these indictment in question were less than \$5,000.

Finding of Facts and Conclusions of Law

Clearly there can be no dispute that said misconduct "perjury" by said prosecutor was prejudicial to the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts. Said actions are in clear violation of SCACR Rule 407, and said Allegation should be considered in this court decision. Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 3.3, Comment towards the tribunal, states upon ascertaining that material evidence is false a lawyer shall seek to persuade "party offering such" that the evidence should not be offered, or if it has been offered, that its false character should be immediately disclosed, the lawyer must take reasonable remedial measures. See Rule 3.4. Fairness to opposing party and counsel, states documents and other items of evidence are often essential to establish a claim or defense, and the exercise of that right ^{can} be frustrated if relevant material is altered, concealed or destroyed.

EXHIBIT CD

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY
2012 JUL 30 PM 3:25
M. HOPE BLACKLEY

Further, falsifying evidence is also generally a criminal offense. See Rule 3.5. Impartiality and Decorum of the Tribunal, States, a lawyer should present the case, protect the record for subsequent review and preserve professional integrity. See Rule 4.1. Truthfulness in Statements to Others, States, a lawyer is required to be "truthful" when dealing with others, misrepresentation can also occur by a failure to act. Further, an attorney has an obligation not only in professional ethics but under law as well to, avoid implications in the commission of perjury or other falsification of evidence. See SCACR Rule 413, Rule (2) Terminology (P) Misconduct: any conduct by a lawyer constituting grounds for discipline, See Rule 7, 1-8, and (2) Serious Crimes: any felony or lesser crime that reflects adversely on a lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness, or involves the interference with the administration of justice, ie, false swearing, misrepresentation, fraud or deceit. See State v Kundberg, 438 S.E. 2d 116 (Ga App 1993), Perjury - a person commits offense of false swearing generally when he, having either taken oath or affirmation or executed documents knowing that it purports to be acknowledgment of lawful oath or affirmation, knowingly and willfully makes false statements. See Statute 18 U.S.C.A § 1621 Perjury/.

2) Involuntary and Unknowing Plea

Additionally, the Applicant is alleging that his guilty plea was not a knowing and intelligent decision among the wide range of choices available to him. Specifically, the applicant was never informed on the record or of the record that said charges would be now considered. In fact applicant

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY

2012 JUL 30 PM 3: 25

M. HOPE BLACKLEY

was informed by counsel as the record will clearly reflect that his plea recommendation was for five counts of forgery and two counts of petty larceny to be run concurrently with each other and with his probation violation, additionally he would plea to one count of obtaining goods by false pretenses, and two counts of receiving stolen goods, with a recommendation of a

consecutive term of ten years suspended to five years of probation with restitution. The remaining three charges will be dismissed. See transcript pg # 17, Lines 1-14., See transcript pg # 17, 18 Lines 20-23, Lines 1-18

Clearly there can be no dispute that such a recommendation existed, was stated on record, and informed to applicant. Clearly there can be no dispute that said plea recommendation was complex and was arranged in three stages. Clearly there can be no dispute that said plea was for a max of a ~~10~~^{five} year sentence.

Further, the record clearly reflects that the applicant was never informed by counsel on or off the record that the state would be seeking sentencing enhancements, more does the record reflect that the applicant was afforded his procedural due process right of a hearing for said enhancements. Clearly the record reflects that these offenses were a continuous chain of one event. See transcript pg # 22, Lines 14-18, which states these all happened kind of in two big blocks. Therefore, applicant was not informed by counsel on or off the record that these offenses should have been treated as continuous chain of one event, or a spree.

Now did counsel fight for the applicant to be sentenced as such. Clearly the way that the applicant was sentenced he received no benefit from a plea and perhaps could have received less time by way of trial. Further, the trial judge never gave applicant a chance to withdraw his plea once the trial judge did not accept the recommendation, and counsel failed to protect that right.

2012 JUL 30 PM 3: 25

M. HOPE BLACKLEY

Clearly pursuant to FRCP Rule 11, states that the court can reject a plea agreement reached between the prosecutor and the defense. The court must inform the parties to the agreement that the agreement is rejected, and must inform the defendant that his or her plea can be withdrawn. Clearly the Record will reflect that the applicant was given the chance to withdraw.

FRCP Rule 11(c)(1)(B) states the court must advise the defendant that the defendant has no right to withdraw the plea if the court does not follow the recommendation or request. Pursuant to FRCP Rule 11(c)(1)(A) OR (C), the court must do the following on the record and in open court (A) inform the parties that the court rejects the plea agreement; (B) advise the defendant personally that the court is not required to follow the plea agreement and give the defendant an opportunity to withdraw the plea; and (C) advise the defendant that if the plea is not withdrawn, the court may dispose of the case less favorably toward the defendant than the plea agreement contemplated. (C)

Therefore, since the applicant was not given the chance to withdraw his plea along with the other above mention mitigating factors, and only plead because of the recommendation of a ~~2~~ year sentence, said plea was not free and voluntary with a full knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the plea.

Findings of facts and conclusions of law

Set forth below are the relevant findings of facts and conclusions of law as required pursuant to SC Code Ann § 17-27-80. In the allegations before this court the applicant is alleging that his plea was not voluntarily and intelligently made. See *State v. Armstrong*, 263 S.C. 594, 201 S.E. 2d 384 (1975)

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY

2012 JUL 30 PM 3: 25

The South Carolina Supreme Court has held that the essence of Boyle was
M. ROPE BLACKLEY
to make the requirements of Rule 11 of The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure
applicable to the States. The Supreme Court has held that for there to be a valid
waiver under the due process clause of the three constitutional rights tested in
Boyle, the record must clearly establish it. See Boyle v. Alabama, 315
U.S. 238, 89 S.Ct. 1709 (1969). A valid waiver of these rights cannot be
preserved by a silent record. See Roddy v. State 339 S.C. 29, 528 S.E.
2d 418 (2000).

result of partiality, prejudice, or corrupt motive; Cummins v. State, 274 S.C. 26, 260 S.E.2d 187 (1979); Wood v. State, 257 S.C. 179, 184 S.E.2d 702 (1971).

See: Sentencing Guidelines, S.C. Code of Law 1976 §16-13-10B; §16-13-240(3); §16-13-30A; 16-13-180(2).

CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA (1976)

11, B. §16-13-10, B. Forgery less than \$5,000

(B). A person who violates the provisions of this section is guilty of a

(2). felony and upon conviction must be fined in the discretion of the court or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, if the amount of the forgery is less than five thousand dollars.

§§16-13-240(3) Breach/obtain signature or property under false pretenses, value \$1,000 or less.

A person who by false pretense, or representation obtains the signature of a person to a written instrument or obtains from another person any chattel, money, valuable security, or other property, real or personal, with intent to cheat and defraud a person of that property is guilty of a:

(3). A misdemeanor triable in magistrates' court if the value of the property is one thousand dollars or less. Upon conviction, the person must be fined or imprisoned not more than is permitted by law without presentment or indictment of the grand jury, Not more than five years.

11, B. §16-13-30(A) Petit larceny; grand larceny

(A) Simple larceny of any article of goods, choses in action bank bills receivable chattels, or other article of personality of which by law larceny may be committed, or of any fixture, part, or product of the soil severed from the soil by an unlawful act, or has a value of one thousand dollars or less is

CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY
2012 FEB -7 AM 8:32
M. HOPKINS-BAILEY

petit larceny, a misdemeanor, triable in the magistrates court. Upon conviction, the person must be fined or imprisoned not more than is permitted by law without presentment or indictment by the grand jury.

§16-13-180(2) Receiving Stolen goods less than \$5,000.

It is unlawful for a person to buy, receive or possess stolen goods, chattel or other property if stolen. A person is guilty of this offense whether or not anyone is convicted of the theft of the property. A person who violates the provision of this section is guilty of a:

(2) Felony, and, upon conviction, must be fined not less than one thousand dollars, or imprisoned not more than five years if the value of the property is more than one thousand dollars but less than five thousand dollars.

Compare codes to indictments; codes match these!

ARGUMENT

It is clear that by reviewing the Sentence Sheets and indictments that the sentencing judge exceeded the guidelines, and violated S.C. Code of Law (1976) and §17-27-20(A)(4). Counsel did not object, or properly inform Applicant that the court was going to exceed the five year sentence promised in the plea bargain, or take any act of effective representation when Applicant was sentenced to four ten year consecutive sentences on original misdemeanor charges.

When Applicant entered a guilty plea he was expecting some relief and benefit from the plea bargain offered by the Solicitor. Counsel should have, at all costs, represented Applicants' plea to the court in Applicants' best interest.

Because the court was going to enhance Applicants' charges to this level, counsel should have advised Applicant that the

CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY
2012 FEB 7 AM 8:33
M. HOPE
S. OXLEY

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG)

INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on MAR 26 2009, the
Grand Jurors of Spartanburg County present upon their oath:

FORGERY < \$5,000

That the defendant, Jeffrey Jeter, did in Spartanburg County on or about April 4, 2008; knowingly and with the intent to defraud: (1) falsely make, forge, counterfeit, cause or procure to be falsely made, forged, or willfully act or assist in the false making, forging or counterfeiting of any writing or instrument of writing; and/or (2) utter or publish as true any false, forged, or counterfeited writing or instrument of writing; and/or (3) willingly act or assist in any of the above activities, said writing or instrument of writing being: that the defendant did forge and publish as true a check, number 292747, in the amount of \$350.00 knowing the document to be forged and for the purpose of obtaining value or benefit from the forged document, in violation of §16-13-10(B)(2), THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA (1976), as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.


ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

DOCK 09-GS-42-1413

The State of South Carolina

County of Spartanburg

Trey Gowdy, Solicitor

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

MAR 30 2009

TERM

THE STATE vs.

Jeffrey Jeter

Indictment for

FORGERY < \$5,000

SC Code: 16-13-10 (B) (2)

CDR Code: 2427

Class FEL/F

WITNESSES

Sheriffs Office

T. H. Caldwell

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

M180193

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

June Bell

Trey Gowdy
Foreperson of Grand Jury
Date: *3-26-09*

SENTENCE MADE

Computer

REPORT ENDED

CARD PULLED

INDEXED

CHECKED WARRANTS

CHECKED SIGNATURE
Date:

Computer

ASSESSMENT AND FINE CARD MADE

TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS COPY

MARC KITCHENS

2009 APR - 1 PM 1:49

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY

COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG
STATE VS. Jeffrey Eugene Jeter
AKA:
Race: B Sex: M Age: 44
DOB: 06-18- SS#:
Address:
City, State, Zip: Spartanburg, SC 29306
DL#: 8046520 SID#:

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2009GS4201413
A/W#: M180193
Date of Offense: 4/4/2008
S.C. Code §: 16-13-0010(B)
CDR Code #: 2427

SENTENCE SHEET

*CDL Yes No CMV Yes No Hazmat Yes No
In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was TO: Forgery / Forgery, value less than \$5,000 (0-10 years)

CONVICTED OF or PLEADS

in violation of § 16-13-0010(B) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 2427
NON-VIOLENT VIOLENT SERIOUS MOST SERIOUS Mandatory GPS(CSC) §17-25-45 w/minor 1st or Lewd Act

The charge is: As Indicted, Lesser Included Offense, Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury.
The plea is: Without Negotiations or Recommendation, Negotiated Sentence, Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: KENDALL, MATT SC Bar# 77013
Defendant
Attorney for Defendant SC Bar# 1207

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the State Department of Corrections, County Detention Center,
for a determinate term of 10 days/months/years or under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed years
and/or to pay a fine of \$; provided that upon the service of 15 days/months/years and/or payment
of \$; plus costs and assessments as applicable*; the balance is suspended with probation for 5

months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 10/28/10 + probation reinstated
The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code § 24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by the State Department of Corrections. 282 days
The Defendant is to be placed on the Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C Section 922, it is unlawful for a person convicted of a violation of Section 16-25-20 or 16-25-65 (Criminal Domestic Violence) to ship, transport, possess, or receive a firearm or ammunition.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTITUTION: Deferred Def. Waives Hearing Ordered PTUP
Total: \$ 4763.50 plus 20% fee: \$
Payment Terms:
Set by SCDPPPS

Recipient:
*Fine:

Table with 3 columns: Description, Amount, Total. Includes items like § 14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5%), § 14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge) \$100, § 14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge) \$100, § 56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment) \$12, § 56-1-286 (DUI Breath Test) \$25, Proviso 47.9 (Public Def/Prob) \$500, § 14-1-212 (Law Enforce. Funding) \$25, § 14-1-213 (Drug Court Surcharge) \$150, § 50-21-114(BUI Breath Test Fee) \$50, § 56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment) \$40/ea, Proviso 90.5 (SCCJA Surcharge) \$5, § 44-53-450(C) (Conditional Discharge) \$350, 3% to County (if paid in installments) \$18.90, TOTAL \$648.90

Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk: P. J. Camp
Court Reporter: P. Green
SCCA/217 (06/2010)

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY
M. HOPE BLAUGLE
2011 MAY -2 AM 9:38
Obtain GED
Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp.
May serve W/E beginning
Substance Abuse Counseling
Random Drug/Alcohol testing
Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly pmts. of \$ beginning
\$ paid to Public Defender Fund
Other: probation to begin upon release from prison

Condition Discharge, § 44-53-450(C) requires \$350 be paid to the Clerk prior to case disposition
Appointed PD or appointed other counsel, § 47.12 requires \$500 be paid to Clerk during probation.

Presiding Judge: [Signature]
Judge Code: 2135
Sentence Date: 10/28/10

*Hold Appeal
By ruling Court
April 21, 2009
3CCAS18*

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG)

INDICTMENT

MAR 26 2009

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on _____, the

Grand Jurors of Spartanburg County present upon their oath:

FORGERY < \$5,000

That the defendant, Jeffrey Jeter, did in Spartanburg County on or about April 3, 2008, knowingly and with the intent to defraud: (1) falsely make, forge, counterfeit, cause or procure to be falsely made, forged, or willfully act or assist in the false making, forging or counterfeiting of any writing or instrument of writing; and/or (2) utter or publish as true any false, forged, or counterfeited writing or instrument of writing; and/or (3) willingly act or assist in any of the above activities, said writing or instrument of writing being: that the defendant did forge and publish as true a check, number 292745, in the amount of \$275.85 knowing the document to be forged and for the purpose of obtaining value or benefit from the forged document, in violation of §16-13-10(B)(2), THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA (1976), as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.


ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

DOCKET NO.

09-GS-42-1414
South Carolina

County of Spartanburg

Trey Gowdy, Solicitor

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

MAR 30 2009 TERM

THE STATE
vs.

Jeffrey Jeter

Indictment for

FORGERY < \$5,000

SC Code: 16-13-10 (B) (2)

CDR Code: 2427

Class FEL/F

WITNESSES

Sheriffs Office

T. K. Deaton

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

M180192

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

June Bell

Shady 32609
Foreperson of Grand Jury
Date

SENTENCE MADE VERDICT

REPORT ENDED **Computer**

CARD PULLED

INDEXED

CHECKED WARRANTS

FORWARDED TO SIGNATURE

Date:

ASSESSMENT AND

FINE CARD MADE

TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS COPY

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
2009 APR - 1 PM 1:49
MARC KITCHENS

COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG
 STATE VS.
Jeffrey Eugene Jeter
 AKA:
 Race: B Sex: M Age: 44
 DOB: 06-18- SS#: _____
 Address:
 City, State, Zip: Spartanburg, SC 29306
 DL#: _____ SID#: _____

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2009GS4201414
 A/W#: M180192
 Date of Offense: 4/3/2008
 S.C. Code § : 16-13-0010(B)
 CDR Code #: 2427

SENTENCE SHEET

*CDL Yes No CMV Yes No Hazmat Yes No
 In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was
 TO: Forgery / Forgery, value less than \$5,000:(0-10 years)

CONVICTED OF or PLEADS

in violation of § 16-13-0010(B) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 2427
 NON-VIOLENT VIOLENT SERIOUS MOST SERIOUS Mandatory GPS(CSC §17-25-45
 w/minor 1st or Lewd Act)

The charge is: As Indicted, Lesser Included Offense, Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury.
 The plea is: Without Negotiations or Recommendation, Negotiated Sentence, Recommendation by the State. (defendant's initials)

ATTEST: KENDALL, MATT 77213 4/4 10/28/10
 SC Bar# Defendant Attorney for Defendant SC Bar#

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the State Department of Corrections, County Detention Center,
 for a determinate term of 10 days/months/years or under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed _____ years
 and/or to pay a fine of \$ _____; provided that upon the service of _____ days/months/years and/or payment
 of \$ _____; plus costs and assessments as applicable*; the balance is suspended with probation for _____

months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of
 probation, which are incorporated by reference.
 CONCURRENT or CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 10/28/10 + prob revocation
 The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code § 24-13-40 to be calculated and applied
 by the State Department of Corrections. 282 days
 The Defendant is to be placed on the Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C Section 922, it is unlawful for a person convicted of a violation of Section 16-25-20 or 16-25-25 (Criminal
 Domestic Violence) to ship, transport, possess, or receive a firearm or ammunition.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTITUTION: Deferred Def. Waives Hearing Ordered
 Total: \$ _____ plus 20% fee: \$ _____

PTUP _____ days/hours Public Service Employment

Payment Terms: _____
 Set by SCDPPPS _____

Obtain GED
 Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp. _____

Recipient: _____
 *Fine: _____

May serve W/E beginning _____
 Substance Abuse Counseling

§ 14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5 %)		\$	
§ 14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge)	\$100	\$	100.00
§ 14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge)	\$100	\$	
§ 56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment)	\$12	\$	
§ 56-1-286 (DUI Breath Test)	\$25	\$	
Proviso 47.9 (Public Def/Prob)	\$500	\$	
§ 14-1-212 (Law Enforce. Funding)	\$25	\$	25.00
§ 14-1-213 (Drug Court Surcharge)	\$150	\$	
§ 50-21-114(BUI Breath Test Fee)	\$50	\$	
§ 56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment)	\$40/ea	\$	
Proviso 90.5 (SCCJA Surcharge)	\$5	\$	5.00
§ 44-53-450(C) (Conditional Discharge)	\$350	\$	
3% to County (if paid in installments)		\$	3.90
TOTAL		\$	133.90

Random Drug/Alcohol testing
 Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly
 pmts. of \$ _____ beginning _____
 \$ _____ paid to Public Defender Fund
 Other: _____

Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk P. Y. J. Camp
 Court Reporter: P. Green
 SCCA/217 (06/2010)

Presiding Judge _____
 Judge Code: 2135
 Sentence Date: 10/28/10

EXHIBIT '1'

FILED
 CLERK OF COURT
 SPARTANBURG COUNTY
 9:11 MAY - 6 AM 9:38
 HOPE FACILITY

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG)


INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on MAR 26 2009, the
Grand Jurors of Spartanburg County present upon their oath:

FORGERY < \$5,000

That the defendant, Jeffrey Jeter, did in Spartanburg County on or about June 25, 2008, knowingly and with the intent to defraud: (1) falsely make, forge, counterfeit, cause or procure to be falsely made, forged, or willfully act or assist in the false making, forging or counterfeiting of any writing or instrument of writing; and/or (2) utter or publish as true any false, forged, or counterfeited writing or instrument of writing; and/or (3) willingly act or assist in any of the above activities, said writing or instrument of writing being: Check No. 1585, in the amount of \$800.00, on an account belonging to the victim Spartanburg Community Memorial Committee, in violation of §16-13-10(B)(2), THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA (1976), as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.


ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

Doc No. 09-GS-42-1415

The State of South Carolina

County of Spartanburg

Trey Gowdy, Solicitor

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

MAR 30 2009

TERM

THE STATE

vs.

Jeffrey Jeter

Indictment for

FORGERY < \$5,000

SC Code: 16-13-10 (B) (2)

CDR Code: 2427

Class FEL/F

WITNESSES

City PD

[Signature]

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

M181352

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

James Bell

[Signature]

Foreperson of Grand Jury

Date: 3-26-09

SENTENCE MADE VERDICT

Computer

1. REPORTED

2. CARD PULLED

3. INDEXED

4. CHECKED WARRANTS

5. FOREPERSON SIGNATURE

Date:

6. ASSESSMENT AND FINE CARD MADE

Computer

7. TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS COPY

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY
2009 APR -1 PM 1:49
MARC KITCHENS

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG
STATE VS. Jeffrey Eugene Jeter
AKA:
Race: B Sex: M Age: 44
DOB: 06-18 SS#:
Address:
City, State, Zip: Spartanburg, SC 29306
DL#: SID#:

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2009GS420.1415
A/W#: M181352
Date of Offense: 6/25/2008
S.C. Code §: 16-13-0010(B)
CDR Code #: 2427

SENTENCE SHEET

*CDL Yes No CMV Yes No Hazmat Yes No
In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was TO: Forgery / Forgery, value less than \$5,000. (0-10 years)

in violation of § 16-13-0010(B) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 2427
NON-VIOLENT VIOLENT SERIOUS MOST SERIOUS
Mandatory GPS(CSC) §17-25-45 w/minor 1st or Lewd Act

The charge is: As Indicted, Lesser Included Offense, Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury.
The plea is: Without Negotiations or Recommendation, Negotiated Sentence, Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: KENDALL, MATT SC Bar#
Defendant
Attorney for Defendant SC Bar#

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the State Department of Corrections, County Detention Center,
for a determinate term of 10 days/months/years or under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed years
and/or to pay a fine of \$; provided that upon the service of days/months/years and/or payment
of \$; plus costs and assessments as applicable*; the balance is suspended with probation for

months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of
probation, which are incorporated by reference.
CONCURRENT or CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 10/28/10 + probata revocation
The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code § 24-13-40 to be calculated and applied
by the State Department of Corrections. 282 days
The Defendant is to be placed on the Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C Section 922, it is unlawful for a person convicted of a violation of Section 16-25-20 or 16-25-65 (Criminal
Domestic Violence) to ship, transport, possess, or receive a firearm or ammunition.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTITUTION: Deferred Def. Waives Hearing Ordered
Total: \$ plus 20% fee: \$
Payment Terms:
Set by SCDPPPS

PTUP days/hours Public Service Employment
Obtain GED
Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp.
May serve W/E beginning
Substance Abuse Counseling
Random Drug/Alcohol testing
Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly
pmts. of \$ beginning
\$ paid to Public Defender Fund
Other:

Table with 3 columns: Description, Amount, Total. Includes items like Assessments, Conv. Surcharge, DUI Surcharge, etc. Total: 133.90

Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk: P. J. Camp
Court Reporter: P. Green
SCCA/217 (06/2010)

Presiding Judge:
Judge Code: 2135
Sentence Date: 10/28/10

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY
MAY 11 AM 9:38

EXHIBIT '1'

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG)

INDICTMENT

MAR 26 2009


At a Court of General Sessions, convened on _____, the

Grand Jurors of Spartanburg County present upon their oath:

FORGERY < \$5,000

That the defendant, Jeffrey Jeter, did in Spartanburg County on or about June 25, 2008, knowingly and with the intent to defraud: (1) falsely make, forge, counterfeit, cause or procure to be falsely made, forged, or willfully act or assist in the false making, forging or counterfeiting of any writing or instrument of writing; and/or (2) utter or publish as true any false, forged, or counterfeited writing or instrument of writing; and/or (3) willingly act or assist in any of the above activities, said writing or instrument of writing being: Check No. 1533, in the amount of \$800.00, on an account belonging to the victim Spartanburg Community Memorial Committee, in violation of §16-13-10(B)(2), THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA (1976), as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.


ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

DOCKET NO. **09-GS-42-1416**
The State of South Carolina

County of Spartanburg
Trey Gowdy, Solicitor

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

MAR 30 2009 TERM

THE STATE
vs.

Jeffrey Jeter

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

M181351

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

Four Bills
Andy

For person of Grand Jury
Date: 3/30/09

SENTENCE MADE VERDICT
Computer

1. REPORT ENDED

2. CARD PULLED

3. INDEXED

4. CHECKED WARRANTS

5. CHECKED SIGNATURE

Foreperson of Grand Jury
Date: FINE CARD MADE

Computer

TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS COPY

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY
2009 APR - 1 PM 1:50
MARC KITCHENS

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG
STATE VS. Jeffrey Eugene Jeter
AKA:
Race: B Sex: M Age: 44
DOB: 06-18- SS#:
Address: 3
City, State, Zip: Spartanburg, SC 29306
DL#: SID#:

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2009GS4201416
A/W#: M181351
Date of Offense: 6/24/2008
S.C. Code §: 16-13-0010(B)
CDR Code #: 2427

SENTENCE SHEET

*CDL Yes No CMV Yes No Hazmat Yes No
In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was TO: Forgery / Forgery, value less than \$5,000 (0-10 years)

CONVICTED OF or PLEADS

in violation of § 16-13-0010(B) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 2427
NON-VIOLENT VIOLENT SERIOUS MOST SERIOUS
Mandatory GPS(CSC) §17-25-45 w/minor 1st or Lewd Act

The charge is: As Indicted, Lesser Included Offense, Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury, Negotiated Sentence, Recommendation by the State.
The plea is: Without Negotiations or Recommendation, Negotiated Sentence, Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: KENDALL, MATT SC Bar# 77213
Defendant
Attorney for Defendant SC Bar# 1207

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the State Department of Corrections, County Detention Center,
for a determinate term of 10 days/months/years or under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed years
and/or to pay a fine of \$; provided that upon the service of days/months/years and/or payment
of \$; plus costs and assessments as applicable*; the balance is suspended with probation for

months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 10/28/10 + probation revocation
The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code § 24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by the State Department of Corrections. 282 days
The Defendant is to be placed on the Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C Section 922, it is unlawful for a person convicted of a violation of Section 16-25-20 or 16-25-65 (Criminal Domestic Violence) to ship, transport, possess, or receive a firearm or ammunition.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTITUTION: Deferred Def. Waives Hearing Ordered
Total: \$ plus 20% fee: \$
Payment Terms:
Set by SCDPPFS

Recipient:
*Fine:

Table with 3 columns: Description, Amount, Total. Includes items like § 14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5 %), § 14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge), § 14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge), § 56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment), § 56-1-286 (DUI Breath Test), Proviso 47.9 (Public Def/Prob), § 14-1-212 (Law Enforce. Funding), § 14-1-213 (Drug Court Surcharge), § 50-21-114 (BUI Breath Test Fee), § 56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment), Proviso 90.5 (SCCJA Surcharge), § 44-53-450(C) (Conditional Discharge), 3% to County (if paid in installments), TOTAL \$133.90

Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk: P. J. Camp
Court Reporter: P. Green
SCCA/217 (06/2010)

PTUP
days/hours Public Service Employment
Obtain GED
Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp.
May serve W/E beginning
Substance Abuse Counseling
Random Drug/Alcohol testing
Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly pmts. of \$ beginning
\$ paid to Public Defender Fund
Other:

Condition Discharge, § 44-53-450(C) requires \$350 be paid to the Clerk prior to case disposition
Appointed PD or appointed other counsel, § 47.12 requires \$500 be paid to Clerk during probation.

Presiding Judge: [Signature]
Judge Code: 2135
Sentence Date: 10/28/10

EXHIBIT '1'

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY
M. HOSE BLAIR
2011 MAY -2 AM 9:30

Spartanburg
County
STATE
N

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG)

INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on MAR 26 2009, the

Grand Jurors of Spartanburg County present upon their oath:

FORGERY < \$5,000

That the defendant, Jeffrey Jeter, did in Spartanburg County on or about September 7, 2008, knowingly and with the intent to defraud: (1) falsely make, forge, counterfeit, cause or procure to be falsely made, forged, or willfully act or assist in the false making, forging or counterfeiting of any writing or instrument of writing; and/or (2) utter or publish as true any false, forged, or counterfeited writing or instrument of writing; and/or (3) willingly act or assist in any of the above activities, said writing or instrument of writing being: that the defendant did forge and publish as true a check #2250 in the amount of \$275.31 knowing the document to be forged and for the purpose of obtaining value or benefit from the forged document, in violation of §16-13-10(B)(2), THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA (1976), as amended.

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.


ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

BOOK No. 42-1802

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY

2009 APR -1 PM 2:53

MARC KITCHENS

The State of South Carolina
County of Spartanburg
Trey Gowdy, Solicitor

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

MAR 30 2009

TERM

THE STATE
vs.

Jeffrey Jeter

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

M111661

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

True Bill

Shady
Foreperson of Grand Jury
Date: 3/20/09

Computer

SENTENCE MADE

VERDICT

REPORT ENDED

CARD PULLED

INDEXED

CHECKED WARRANTS

FOREPERS. OF GRAND JURY

ASSESSMENT AND FINE CARD MADE

TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS COPY

Indictment for

FORGERY < \$5,000

SC Code: 16-13-10 (B) (2)

CDR Code: 2427

Class FEL/F

Computer

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG
STATE VS.
Jeffrey Jeter
AKA:
Race: B Sex: M Age: 44
DOB: 06-18 SS#:
Address:
City, State, Zip: Spartanburg, SC 29306
DL#: 8046520 SID#:

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2009GS4201802
A/W#: M111661
Date of Offense: 9/7/2008
S.C. Code §: 16-13-0010(B)
CDR Code #: 2427

SENTENCE SHEET

*CDL Yes No CMV Yes No Hazmat Yes No
In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was
TO: Forgery / Forgery, value less than \$5,000

CONVICTED OF or PLEADS

in violation of § 16-13-0010(B) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 2427
NON-VIOLENT VIOLENT SERIOUS MOST SERIOUS
Mandatory GPS(CSC §17-25-45 w/minor 1st or Lewd Act)

The charge is: As Indicted, Lesser Included Offense, Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury.
The plea is: Without Negotiations or Recommendation, Negotiated Sentence, Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST:
KENDALL, MATT SC Bar# 77213 Defendant
Attorney for Defendant SC Bar# 1257

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the State Department of Corrections, County Detention Center,
for a determinate term of 10 days/months/years or under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed years
and/or to pay a fine of \$; provided that upon the service of days/months/years and/or payment
of \$; plus costs and assessments as applicable*; the balance is suspended with probation for

months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of
probation, which are incorporated by reference.
CONCURRENT or CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 10/28/10 + probation revocable
The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code § 24-13-40 to be calculated and applied
by the State Department of Corrections. 282 days
The Defendant is to be placed on the Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C Section 922, it is unlawful for a person convicted of a violation of Section 16-25-20 or 16-25-65 (Criminal
Domestic Violence) to ship, transport, possess, or receive a firearm or ammunition.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTITUTION: Deferred Def. Waives Hearing Ordered PTUP
Total: \$ plus 20% fee: \$
Payment Terms:
Set by SCDPPS

Recipient:
*Fine:

Table with 3 columns: Description, Amount, Total. Includes items like § 14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5%), § 14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge) \$100, § 14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge) \$100, § 56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment) \$12, § 56-1-286 (DUI Breath Test) \$25, Proviso 47.9 (Public Def/Prob) \$500, § 14-1-212 (Law Enforce. Funding) \$25, § 14-1-213 (Drug Court Surcharge) \$150, § 50-21-114 (BUI Breath Test Fee) \$50, § 56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment) \$40/ea, Proviso 90.5 (SCCJA Surcharge) \$5, § 44-53-450(C) (Conditional Discharge) \$350, 3% to County (if paid in installments) \$3.90, TOTAL \$133.90

days/hours Public Service Employment
Obtain GED
Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp.
May serve W/E beginning
Substance Abuse Counseling
Random Drug/Alcohol testing
Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly
pmts. of \$ beginning
\$ paid to Public Defender Fund
Other:

Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk P. J. Camp
Court Reporter: P. Green
SCCA/217 (06/2010)

Condition Discharge, § 44-53-450(C) requires
\$350 be paid to the Clerk prior to case disposition
Appointed PD or appointed other counsel,
§ 47.12 requires \$500 be paid to Clerk
during probation.
Presiding Judge
Judge Code: 2135
Sentence Date: 10/28/10

DOCKET NO.

10-GS-42-5617

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY

2010 OCT -4 PM 2:07

M. HOPE BLACKLEY

The State of South Carolina

County of Spartanburg

Trey Gowdy, Solicitor

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

OCT 11 2010

TERM

THE STATE
vs.

Jeffrey Jeter

Indictment for

LARCENY/ PETIT OR SIMPLE
\$2,000 OR LESS

SC Code: 16-13-0030 (A); 16-01-0057

CDR Code: 2367

Class: Unclassified

WITNESSESS

Spartanburg Public Safety

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

M1122390

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

True Bill

Foreperson of Grand Jury

Date: 9 30 10

VERDICT
Computer

3. REPORT ENDED

5. CARD PULLED

4. INDEXED

5. CHECKED WARRANTS

6. CHECKED SIGNATURES

FOREPERSON OF GRAND JURY
DATE CARD MADE

Computer

TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS COPY

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG
STATE VS. Jeffrey Eugene Jeter
AKA:
Race: B Sex: M Age: 44
DOB: 06-13-66 SS#:
Address:
City, State, Zip: Spartanburg, SC 29306
DL#: SID#:

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2010GS4205617
A/W#: M122390
Date of Offense: 8/6/2010
S.C. Code §: 16-13-0030(A)
CDR Code #: 3419

SENTENCE SHEET

*CDL Yes No CMV Yes No Hazmat Yes No

In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was TO: Larceny Petit or Simple Larceny - \$2,000 or less (0-10 years) CONVICTED OF or PLEADS

in violation of 16-13-0030(A) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 3419
NON-VIOLENT VIOLENT SERIOUS MOST SERIOUS
Mandatory GPS(CSC w/minor 1st or Lewd Act) §17-25-45

The charge is as Indicted. Lesser Included Offense, Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury.
The plea is Without Negotiations or Recommendation, Negotiated Sentence, Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST:
KLINE MATT 77213 SC Bar#
Defendant
Attorney for Defendant 1207 SC Bar#

WHEREBY Defendant is committed to the State Department of Corrections, County Detention Center,
for a determinate term of 10 days/months/years or under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed years
and/or to pay of \$; provided that upon the service of days/months/years and/or payment
of \$ plus costs and assessments as applicable*; the balance is suspended with probation for

months/years subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of
probation as incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 10/28/10 + Prob Par
The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code § 24-13-40 to be calculated and applied
by the State Department of Corrections. 282 days
The Defendant is to be placed on the Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

Pursuant to S.C. Section 922, it is unlawful for a person convicted of a violation of Section 16-25-20 or 16-25-65 (Criminal
Domestic Violence) to ship, transport, possess, or receive a firearm or ammunition.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTRICTIONS: Deferred Def. Waives Hearing Ordered PTUP

Total: plus 20% fee: \$ days/hours Public Service Employment

Payment on Obtain GED

Set by SC Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp.

Receipt May serve W/E beginning

*Fine: Substance Abuse Counseling

§ 14-1-20 (A) (Fines 107.5%) \$

§ 14-1-20 (B) (Court Fee Surcharges) \$100 \$ 100.00

§ 14-1-20 (A)(1) (County Fee Surcharges) \$100 \$

§ 14-1-20 (B) (County Assessment) \$12 \$

§ 14-1-20 (C) (County Health Test) \$25 \$

Provisional (County Fee/Prob) \$500 \$

§ 14-1-20 (D) (County Force Funding) \$25 \$ 25.00

§ 14-1-20 (E) (County Court Surcharges) \$150 \$

§ 14-1-20 (F) (County Health Test Fee) \$50 \$

§ 14-1-20 (J) (County Fee Assessment) \$40/ea \$

Provisional (County Surcharges) \$5 \$ 5.00

§ 14-1-20 (G) (County Conditional Discharge) \$350 \$

3" (County Fee paid in installments) \$ 3.90

Total \$ 133.90

Clerk P. J. Camp

County Reporter P. Green

Sentence Date: 10/28/10

Presiding Judge

Judge Code: 2135

Sentence Date: 10/28/10

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG)

INDICTMENT

At a Court of General Sessions, convened on SEP 30 2010, the
Grand Jurors of Spartanburg County present upon their oath:

Larceny/Petit or Simple Larceny - 3rd or Subsequent

That Jeffrey Jeter, did in Spartanburg County on or about June 27, 2010, take and carry away goods and/or monies valued at Two Thousand Dollars or less, to wit: US Currency in the amount of One Hundred Thirty Dollars (\$130.00), with the intent to deprive the owner, permanently of such property. Further, that the Defendant has at least (2) two or more prior convictions for Property Crimes, all in violation of §16-13-30 (A), and §16-01-0057, *THE CODE OF LAWS OF SOUTH CAROLINA*, (1976, as amended).

Against the peace and dignity of the State, and contrary to the statute in such case made and provided.



ASSISTANT SOLICITOR

DOCKET NO.

10-GS-42-5616

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SPARTANBURG COUNTY

2010 OCT -4 PM 2:07

M. HOPE BLACKLEY

The State of South Carolina

County of Spartanburg

Trey Gowdy, Solicitor

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

OCT 11 2010

TERM

THE STATE

vs.

Jeffrey Jeter

Indictment for

LARCENY/ PETIT OR SIMPLE

\$2,000 OR LESS

SC Code: 16-13-0030 (A); 16-01-0057

CDR Code: 2367

Class: Unclassified

WITNESSESS

Spartanburg Public Safety

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

M122187

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

True Bill

Foreperson of Grand Jury

Date: 9/30/10

1. SENTENCE MADE VERDICT

2. REPORT ENDED Computer

3. CARD PULLED

4. INDEXED

5. CHECKED WARRANTS

Foreperson of Grand Jury

Date

ASSESSMENT AND FINE CARD MADE Computer

TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS COPY

DOCKET NO.

09-GS-42-1419
The State of South Carolina

WITNESSES

City PD

County of Spartanburg

Trey Gowdy, Solicitor

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

MAR 30 2009

TERM

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

THE STATE
vs.

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

Jeffrey Jeter

M180200

SENTENCE MADE

Indictment for

1. REPORT ENDED

RSG/RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS
<\$1000

VERDICT
Computer

2. CARD PULLED

3. CHECKED WARRANTS

SC Code: 16-13-180(1)
CDR Code: 512
Class MIS/UNC

4. INDEXED

5. CHECKED SIGNATURE

FOR ASSESSMENT AND FINE CARD MADE
Computer

6. PUBLIC VIOLE ATTORNEY FEE

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
SOUTH CAROLINA
2009 APR - 1 PM 1:50
MARC KITCHENS

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG
STATE VS. Jeffrey Eugene Jeter
AKA:
Race: B Sex: M Age: 44
DOB: 06-18-99#
Address:
City, State, Zip: Spartanburg, SC 29306
DL#: 8046570 SID#:

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2009GS4201419
A/W#: M180200
Date of Offense: 3/28/2008
S.C. Code § : 16-13-0180(1)
CDR Code #: 0512

SENTENCE SHEET

*CDL Yes No CMV Yes No Hazmat Yes No
In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was TO: RSG / Receiving stolen goods, value less than \$1,000 (0-10 years)

CONVICTED OF or PLEADS

in violation of § 16-13-0180(1) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 0512
NON-VIOLENT VIOLENT SERIOUS MOST SERIOUS Mandatory GPS(CSC §17-25-45 w/minor. 1st or Lewd Act)

The charge is: As Indicted, Lesser Included Offense, Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury.
The plea is: Without Negotiations or Recommendation, Negotiated Sentence, Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: KENDALL, MATT SC Bar# 77213 Defendant Attorney for Defendant SC Bar# 1207

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the State Department of Corrections, County Detention Center,
for a determinate term of 10 days/months/years or under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed years
and/or to pay a fine of \$; provided that upon the service of days/months/years and/or payment
of \$; plus costs and assessments as applicable*; the balance is suspended with probation for

months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 10/28/10 + prob. revocate
The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code § 24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by the State Department of Corrections. 282 days
The Defendant is to be placed on the Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C Section 922, it is unlawful for a person convicted of a violation of Section 16-25-20 or 16-25-65 (Criminal Domestic Violence) to ship, transport, possess, or receive a firearm or ammunition.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTITUTION: Deferred Def. Waives Hearing Ordered PTUP
Total: \$ plus 20% fee: \$
Payment Terms:

Set by SCDPPPS
Recipient:
*Fine:

Table with 3 columns: Description, Amount, Total. Includes items like § 14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5 %), § 14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge), § 14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge), § 56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment), § 56-1-286 (DUI Breath Test), Proviso 47.9 (Public Def/Prob), § 14-1-212 (Law Enforce. Funding), § 14-1-213 (Drug Court Surcharge), § 50-21-114 (BUI Breath Test Fee), § 56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment), Proviso 90.5 (SCCJA Surcharge), § 44-53-450(C) (Conditional Discharge), 3% to County (if paid in installments), TOTAL \$ 133.90

days/hours Public Service Employment
Obtain GED
Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp.
May serve W/E beginning
Substance Abuse Counseling
Random Drug/Alcohol testing
Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly pmts. of \$ beginning \$ paid to Public Defender Fund
Other:

Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk: P. Y. J. Camp
Court Reporter: P. Green
SCCA/217 (06/2010)

Condition Discharge, § 44-53-450(C) requires \$350 be paid to the Clerk prior to case disposition
Appointed PD or appointed other counsel, § 47.12 requires \$500 be paid to Clerk during probation.
Presiding Judge: [Signature]
Judge Code: 2135
Sentence Date: 10/28/10

DOCKET NO. **09-GS-42-1420**
The State of South Carolina

County of Spartanburg

Trey Gowdy, Solicitor

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

MAR 30 2009

TERM

THE STATE
vs.

Jeffrey Jeter

Indictment for
RSG/RECEIVING STOLEN GOODS
>\$1000<5000

SC Code: 16-13-180(2)
CDR Code: 513
Class MIS/UNC

WITNESSES

Spartanburg County Sheriff's Office

T. H. T. [Signature]

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

M181939

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

True Bill

[Signature]
Foreperson of Grand Jury
Date: *3-26-09*

3. REPORTED VERBICALLY
Computer

4. CARD PULLED

4. INDEXED

5. CHECKED WARRANTS

6. CHECKED SIGNATURE

ASSESSMENT AND FINE CARD MADE
Foreperson of Grand Jury
Date: **Computer**

TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS COPY

FILED
CLERK OF COURT
2009 APR - 1 PM 1:50
MARC KITCHENS

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG
STATE VS. Jeffrey Eugene Jeter
AKA:
Race: B Sex: M Age: 44
DOB: 06-18- SS#:
Address:
City, State, Zip: Spartanburg, SC 29306
DL#: SID#:

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2009GS4201420
A/W#: M181939
Date of Offense: 7/15/2008
S.C. Code § : 16-13-0180(2)
CDR Code #: 0513

SENTENCE SHEET

*CDL Yes No CMV Yes No Hazmat Yes No
In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was CONVICTED OF or PLEADS
TO: RSG / Receiving stolen goods, value more than \$1,000 but less than \$5,000 (0-10years)

in violation of § 16-13-0180(2) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 0513
NON-VIOLENT VIOLENT SERIOUS MOST SERIOUS Mandatory GPS(CSC §17-25-45 w/minor 1st or Lewd Act)

The charge is: As Indicted. Lesser Included Offense, Defendant Waives Presentation to Grand Jury. (defendant's initials)
The plea is: Without Negotiations or Recommendation, Negotiated Sentence, Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: KENDALL, MATT SC Bar# 77213
Defendant Attorney for Defendant SC Bar# 1207

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the State Department of Corrections, County Detention Center,
for a determinate term of 10 days/months/years or under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed years
and/or to pay a fine of \$; provided that upon the service of days/months/years and/or payment
of \$; plus costs and assessments as applicable*; the balance is suspended with probation for

months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of
probation, which are incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 10/28/10 + probation revoked
The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code § 24-13-40 to be calculated and applied
by the State Department of Corrections. 282 days
The Defendant is to be placed on the Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code §17-25-135.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C Section 922, it is unlawful for a person convicted of a violation of Section 16-25-20 or 16-25-65 (Criminal
Domestic Violence) to ship, transport, possess, or receive a firearm or ammunition.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTITUTION: Deferred Def. Waives Hearing Ordered PTUP
Total: \$ plus 20% fee: \$
Payment Terms:
Set by SCDPPPS

Recipient:
*Fine:

Table with 3 columns: Description, Amount, Total. Includes items like Assessments 107.5%, Conv. Surcharge \$100, DUI Surcharge \$100, DUI Assessment \$12, DUI Breath Test \$25, Public Def/Prob \$500, Law Enforce. Funding \$25, Drug Court Surcharge \$150, BUI Breath Test Fee \$50, Vehicle Assessment \$40/ea, SCCJA Surcharge \$5, Conditional Discharge \$350, 3% to County \$3.90, TOTAL \$133.90.

days/hours Public Service Employment
Obtain GED
Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp.
May serve W/E beginning
Substance Abuse Counseling
Random Drug/Alcohol testing
Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly
pmts. of \$ beginning
\$ paid to Public Defender Fund
Other:

Condition Discharge, § 44-53-450(C) requires
\$350 be paid to the Clerk prior to case disposition
Appointed PD or appointed other counsel,
§ 47.12 requires \$500 be paid to Clerk
during probation.

Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk: P. Green J. Camp
Court Reporter: P. Green
SCCA/217 (06/2010)

Presiding Judge: [Signature]
Judge Code: 2135
Sentence Date: 10/28/10

DOCKET NO. **09-GS-42** 1421

The State of South Carolina
County of Spartanburg
Trey Gowdy, Solicitor

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS
MAR 30 2009
TERM

THE STATE
vs.

Jeffrey Jeter

Indictment for
OBTAINING MONEY BY
FALSE PRETENSES

SC Code: 16-13-0240 (3)
CDR Code: 1186
Class FEL/E

2009 APR -1 PM 1:50
MARC KITCHENS

FILED
CLERK OF COURT

WITNESSES

Sheriffs Office

T. A. Turner

ARREST WARRANT NUMBER

M181940

ACTION OF GRAND JURY

True Bell

Andrew
Foreperson of Grand Jury
Date: *3-26-09*

VERDICT

SENTENCE MADE
Computer

1. REPORTED

2. CARD PULLED

3. INDEXED

4. CHECKED WARRANTS

5. CHECKED SIGNATURE

6. ASSESSMENT AND FINE CARD MADE

7. TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS COPY

Computer

COUNTY OF SPARTANBURG
STATE VS. Jeffrey Eugene Jeter
AKA:
Race: B Sex: M Age: 44
DOB: 06-18- SS#:
Address:
City, State, Zip: Spartanburg, SC 29306
DL#: SID#:

INDICTMENT/CASE#: 2009GS4201421
A/W#: M181940
Date of Offense: 7/29/2008
S.C. Code §: 16-13-0240(3)
CDR Code #: 1186

SENTENCE SHEET

*CDL Yes No CMV Yes No Hazmat Yes No
In disposition of the said indictment comes now the Defendant who was CONVICTED OF or PLEADS TO: Breach / Obtain signature or prop. under false pretenses, value \$1,000 or less (0-10 years)

in violation of § 16-13-0240(3) of the S.C. Code of Laws, bearing CDR Code # 1186
NON-VIOLENT VIOLENT SERIOUS MOST SERIOUS
Mandatory GPS(CSC §17-25-45 w/minor 1st or Lewd Act)

The charge is: As Indicted. Lesser Included Offense, Defendant Waives Presentment to Grand Jury.
The plea is: Without Negotiations or Recommendation, Negotiated Sentence, Recommendation by the State.

ATTEST: KENDALL, MATT (77213 SC Bar#) Defendant, Attorney for Defendant (1207 SC Bar#)

WHEREFORE, the Defendant is committed to the State Department of Corrections, County Detention Center,
for a determinate term of 10 days/months/years or under the Youthful Offender Act not to exceed years
and/or to pay a fine of \$; provided that upon the service of days/months/years and/or payment
of \$; plus costs and assessments as applicable*; the balance is suspended with probation for

months/years and subject to South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole and Pardon Services standard conditions of probation, which are incorporated by reference.

CONCURRENT or CONSECUTIVE to sentence on: 10/28/10 + prob. rev.
The Defendant is to be given credit for time served pursuant to S.C. Code § 24-13-40 to be calculated and applied by the State Department of Corrections. 282 days
The Defendant is to be placed on the Central Registry of Child Abuse and Neglect pursuant to S.C. Code § 17-25-135.

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C Section 922, it is unlawful for a person convicted of a violation of Section 16-25-20 or 16-25-65 (Criminal Domestic Violence) to ship, transport, possess, or receive a firearm or ammunition.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS:

RESTITUTION: Deferred Def. Waives Hearing Ordered PTUP
Total: \$ plus 20% fee: \$
Payment Terms:
Set by SCDPPPS

Recipient:
*Fine:
§ 14-1-206 (Assessments 107.5 %) \$
§ 14-1-211(A)(1) (Conv. Surcharge) \$100 \$ 100.00
§ 14-1-211(A)(2) (DUI Surcharge) \$100 \$
§ 56-5-2995 (DUI Assessment) \$12 \$
§ 56-1-286 (DUI Breath Test) \$25 \$
Proviso 47.9 (Public Def/Prob) \$500 \$
§ 14-1-212 (Law Enforce. Funding) \$25 \$ 25.00
§ 14-1-213 (Drug Court Surcharge) \$150 \$
§ 50-21-114(BUI Breath Test Fee) \$50 \$
§ 56-5-2942(J) (Vehicle Assessment) \$40/ea \$
Proviso 90.5 (SCCJA Surcharge) \$5 \$ 5.00
§ 44-53-450(C) (Conditional Discharge) \$350 \$
3% to County (if paid in installments) \$ 3.90
TOTAL \$ 133.90

days/hours Public Service Employment
Obtain GED
Attend Voc. Rehab. or Job Corp.
May serve W/E beginning
Substance Abuse Counseling
Random Drug/Alcohol testing
Fine may be pd. in equal, consecutive weekly/monthly pmts. of \$ beginning
\$ paid to Public Defender Fund
Other:

Clerk of Court/ Deputy Clerk P. J. Camp
Court Reporter: P. Green
SCCA/217 (06/2010)

Presiding Judge
Judge Code: 2135
Sentence Date: 10/28/10