

RECEIVED

May 08 2025

SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Florence County
The Honorable D. Craig Brown, Circuit Court Judge

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

v.

QUINTERRIS JAVON CARMICHAEL,

APPELLANT.

Appellate Case No. 2023-000162

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Pursuant to Rule 221(a), SCACR, counsel for Respondent petitions this Court for rehearing.¹ Counsel respectfully submits that this Court has misapprehended certain factual and legal matters in arriving at its holding. Respondent would respectfully argue:

1. While Respondent acknowledges that this Court is obliged to follow established precedent from the South Carolina Supreme Court, the unusual circumstances of this case warranted the trial court's decision to forego verbal jury polling in favor of relying upon the raising of hands by each juror. As the trial court noted, "in the 13 years [he's] been on the bench" he had never had anything happen like what took place during the course of this trial. (R. p. 412). The numerous occurrences impacting juror safety, courthouse safety, and juror

¹ A Petition for Rehearing is required before a party can seek a Writ of Certiorari from the South Carolina Supreme Court. Rule 242, SCACR.

tampering created a basis for distinction from *Wright* and an environment wherein departure from the verbal affirmation was necessary. As the record demonstrates conclusively that Appellant’s guilty verdict was unanimous, there is no reversible error stemming from “structural error.”

2. As Respondent argued, the potential for structural error does not exist within the *method* of polling, but in the black and white assurance that a unanimous verdict was secured. The distinction is a vital one, and it demonstrates the underlying error that is set forth in *State v. Wright*, 439 S.C. 101, 886 S.E.2d 206 (2023). The jury delivered a unanimous verdict. The record demonstrates that there is *no evidence* to the contrary, and the trial court polled the jury to further ensure such. No structural error exists that warrants the overturning of the jury’s conviction.

CONCLUSION

Based upon the above arguments, Respondent asserts that this Court has misapprehended certain facts and law that led to an improper result in this case. Respondent respectfully petitions for rehearing on this matter, and that for all the foregoing reasons, the judgments of the trial court, along with the defendant’s convictions and sentences should be affirmed.

Respectfully Submitted,

ALAN WILSON
Attorney General

DONALD J. ZELENKA
Deputy Attorney General

MELODY J. BROWN
Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General

W. JOSEPH MAYE
Assistant Attorney General
Fed. ID No. 11644

Office of the Attorney General
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1549
(803) 734-6305

May 8, 2025.

By: s/W. Joseph Maye
ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

RECEIVED

May 08 2025

SC Court of Appeals

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE COURT OF APPEALS

Appeal from Florence County
The Honorable D. Craig Brown, Circuit Court Judge

THE STATE,

RESPONDENT,

v.

QUINTERRIS JAVON CARMICHAEL,

APPELLANT.

Appellate Case No. 2023-000162

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, **Donna D'Alessio**, an employee of the Respondent and legal assistant to W. Joseph Maye, of counsel for the Respondent, hereby certify that as per the March 20, 2020 Order of the Chief Justice, the Petition for Rehearing has been forwarded to Appellant's counsel, Laura M. Caudy, Esq., via email today, May 8, 2025 to lcaudy@sccid.sc.gov and to her assistant at smcinnis@sccid.sc.gov.

I further certify that all parties required by Rule to be served have been served.

This 8th day of May, 2025.

s/ Donna D'Alessio

Donna D'Alessio, Legal Assistant to
W. Joseph Maye,
Assistant Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1549
(803) 734-6305