

Cover Letter

Honorable Jenny Kitching
Post Office Box 11629
Columbia, S.C. 29211

Jamie Goss 291885
Waterloo Prison
P.O. Box 189

RECEIVED S.C. ~~29128~~

AUG 07 2025

29128

SC Court of Appeals

Dear Honorable Clerk

Enclose are petition motion to reconsider,
En Banc, and Reinstate. Petition pray
that this Honorable Court send a
copy back file and send a copy
to all other parties due to extraordinary
reason.

Jamie Goss

Index

1. Cover Letter _____ p. 0.
2. Objection _____ p. 1-3
3. Argument _____ p. 4-14
4. Designation To Be Included on Recorded
of Appeal _____ p. 15
5. Order From Supreme Court _____ p. 16
6. Court of Appeal Letter _____ p. 17-20
7. Supreme Court ~~order~~ Letter _____ p. 21-22
8. Court of Appeal Order _____ p. 23
9. Proof of Service _____ p. 24

Petition object to this honorable court order date July 29, 2025 for the following reason that violate Roe V. Wade, U.S.C.A. Amendment 14, 8, 5, emergency situation, Novel Issue, error of law, change in control law, when public Interest involve, substantial circumstance, Rule 204 Art. 5 section 5, Rule 245, Rule 59(e), Rule 52(b), Art. 1 section 23, Art. 1 section 9, Title 24-1-20, Art. 12 section 12, Equity, U.S.C.A. ~~Amendment 14, 8, 5~~ and United State Article: The court of appeal don't have jurisdiction according to Rule 60, Relief from Judgement, (due to the violate 10 day rule of an order), mistake, overlook, because petition never got a respond from the objection after 10 day. Also according to the letter ~~Process Object~~ ~~and~~ date May 23, 2025 petition object to S.C. Supreme Court order, Complaining

About Question 1-16. ON June 11 2025 petition receive a letter from S.C. Court of appeal for deficiencies and not signed document. ON July 15 S.C. Supreme court respond to petition letter from July 14, 2025 saying petition can't file petition without a lawyer, petition object to ~~the~~ letter state that he don't have a lawyer, with a copy of letter from court, "state relieve as counsel". Also according to the law Roe v. Wade they must understand that a person prose can file any petition to the court and if not the court has violate U.S.C.A Amendment 14, 8, 5. ON July 29 2025 petition receive order from S.C. Court of appeal dismissing his case according to Rule 267(b), for not signing, when ~~the~~ S.C. Court of Appeal don't have jurisdiction ~~because~~ to hear case because petition never got an objection from order and case pending in

2

Horry County Court of General Session
according to Rule 59(e) and 52(b)
and Art. 1 section 15 motion.

Pitition prays that this honor court
grant motion and Judgement and
3 Trillion and erase recorded with
taxes free money and release petition
due to false imprisonment.

Jamie 

Argument

1. Did the court overlook considering Solicitor Misconduct for Not Interpering Case and Not reading issue to the Court?

Petition contends the circuit court Solicitor violate petition personal privacy during trial and reconsider motion due to Solicitor Misconduct for Not Interpering case to the court during reconsideration motion. Also during trial the Solicitor should've Never change the Grand Jury Indictment to 3rd offense, when ~~was Indicted~~ petition was Indicted to first Offence Trafficking Cocaine Base. (Roe v. Wade)

2. Did the court overlook considering petition lawyer was relieve as Counsel ~~and during~~ and Interpering the wrong case to petition and Never read issue to the court?

Petition contends the circuit court lawyer violate petition personal privacy during trial and reconsider motions. During petition case, his trial lawyer never talk with him until the day before trial and interper the wrong case to petition when petition had a pending charge for five year and decide to take him to trial within 90 days of a pending charge that violate Amendment 14, 8, 5. Also during reconsider motion petition lawyer never read issue to the court and instruct petition to read the wrong information to the court because petition had two different pending motion in the United State Supreme Court and Horry County General Session Court.

3. Did the court overlook considering petition personal privacy was violate due to all white Jury and espeicallly when state strike the only black Jury?

Petition argue that the lawyer and Solicitor violate his personal privacy during jury Selection when he was never inform

Of Jury selection and never had the option to pick his jury of his pair that was discriminatory by striking the only black jury according (Batson) with no exploitation especially when the grand jury was never indicted to trafficking 3rd that violate U.S.C.A. Amendment 14, 8, 5 and Roe V. Wade

4. Did the court overlook considering petitioners personal privacy was violate due to Solicitor Interpering drugs to the jury in grain to paint a picture of a larger amount to convict petition?

Petition argue that his personal privacy was violate due to Solicitor Interpering drugs to the jury in grain to paint a picture of a larger amount to convict petition especially when drug metric weight is 6 gram. ~~the~~ ~~amount~~ ~~the~~

5. Did the court overlook considering Rule 60(b)(3) was violated due to false indictment when petition was never indicted to the Grand Jury for ~~the~~ trafficking 3rd offense and violate enhancing policy?

- Petition argue that the court overlook petition case as a whole due to false indictment when petition was indicted to first offense Trafficking and the court violate substantial constitutional issue according to Article 1 section 9 and Article 1 section 23 when court and solicitor enhance petition case to 3rd offense.

6. Did the court overlook considering the clerk and S.C.D.C. fail to inform petition of court date?

Petition argue that Clerk and S.C.D.C. violate U.S.C.A. Amendment 14 and Roe v.

Wade for Not informing petition of Court date especially when petition lawyer and solicitor fail to interpered case to the court.

7. Did the court over look considering the Judge fail to ask lawyer and Solicitor to read issue and should've put in a continue when petition said he was not perpare for trial and reconsider motion?

Petition argue that the court overlook petition personal privacy when his lawyer and solicitor fail to take him to trial for a pending charge for five years; Instead they took him to trial within 90 for a pending charge that voilate U.S.C.A. Amendment 14 especially when his trial lawyer never talk with him and perpare his case. Also during petition reconsider motion

8

the court that petition had an issue with grain being explain to the jury and that the trial court violate Article 1 section 9, and Article 1 section 15.

Petition would also like to inform the court that S.C.D.C. violate Art. 12 section 2 and Title 24-7-20 by NOT inform him of court hearing, when petition was never prepare for court that violate U.S.C.A. Amendment 14, 8.

8. Did the court overlook considering S.C.D.C. being short of staff in every department and prison over crowded that cause pain and suffering from not having in place legal supplies for indigent inmate especially when S.C. District court deny petition case due to said reason.

• Petition argue that the court violate article 1 section 15 and U.S.C.A. Amendment 9

14, and Roe v. Wade for not granting petition bond during these extraordinary circumstance that cause pain and suffering for not having legal supply's in place that lead to Frustate Doctrine that cause U.S. District Court and S.C. Court of Appeal to dismiss petition case, especially when he went to lockup and his court deadline ^{letter} got missing.

9. According to Roe v. Wade did the court overlook considering drug law was change in petition case and should have never been enhance to 3rd offense especially when the chemistry was different?

Petition argue that the characteristic of the same prison will have the same opportunity as Federal prison when the drug law was change according to S.C. and U.S. Laws especially when

drug should have never been enhanced to 3rd offense with different chemistry.

10. Did the court consider S.C. District court has deny petition case due to violate S.C.D.C. Policy access to court and should grant petition bond to fight his case in United State Supreme Court?

Petitioner argue that his ~~privacy~~ personal privacy was violate ta'due to S.C.D.C being short of staff and S.C.D.C Policy access to court and should grant petition bond to fight his case especially when the court deny his case for said reason.
(U.S.C.A. Amendment 14.8,5)

11. Did the court overlook considering United State Military Law with only having one son and should take

in consideration that petition miss all his kids early age in prison and he the only son?

The military Law give petition the same right with only one son because it give a person skills and craft under the law same characteristic as a prisoner, according to the law

12. Did the court overlook considering officer testimony (violate expert witness policy) when officer recorded over high speed chase video tape?

Petition argue that a expert would not recorded over a high speed chase video tape that violate expert witness video testimony according to the law and petition was sentence to 28 year.

13. Did the court overlook considering that petitioner was a leader for over 1000 inmates and was restored according to Art. 12 section 2 and Title 24-1-20 and should release petitioner or set bond?

Petitioner argue that he has overcome life and master S.C.D.C Law and should be release or set on bond to create an after life for his pending case. (Mean New Life)

14. Did the court overlook considering false imprisonment as an element when jury was instructed false information?

Petitioner argue that the law was broken because the jury was explain in grain and not gram when drugs metric weight is grams. 13

Designation To Be Included ON Record Of Appeal

1. Enhancement Policy
2. Enhancement Bill
3. Jury Pole Policy
4. Expert witness policy
5. Expert Policy
6. Video Camar policy in police car
7. Transcript
8. Stenography
9. Military Policy
10. Solicitor Policy
11. Public defended Policy
12. Circuit Court Judge Policy
13. Traffic Stop policy
14. Jury Instruction Policy
15. Grain Policy
16. gram Policy
17. All drug law bill pass from 2007
18. Proable Cause Policy 15

The Supreme Court of South Carolina

Jamie Goss, Appellant,

v.

State of South Carolina, Respondent.

Appellate Case No. 2025-001019

ORDER

Pursuant to Rule 204(a) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules, this matter is hereby transferred to the South Carolina Court of Appeals.

FOR THE COURT

BY Patricia A. Howard
CLERK

Columbia, South Carolina
May 23, 2025

cc: Jamie Goss, 00294885
Nancy R. Livesay
The Honorable Jenny A. Kitchings



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

CATHERINE S. HARRISON
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

June 11, 2025

Jamie Goss, 00294885
Wateree River Correctional Institution
P. O. Box 189
Rembert SC 29128-0189

Re: The State v. Jamie Goss
Appellate Case No. 2025-001019

Dear Mr. Goss:

Upon reviewing your Notice of Appeal, the following deficiency or deficiencies have been noted under the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR), and any deficiency must be corrected within ten (10) days of the date of this letter or this matter will be dismissed:

- The accompanying proof of service is not in compliance with the SCACR. Your proof of service should be substantially in the format shown by Form 7 in Appendix C to part II of the SCACR. Specifically, you must provide the address where Respondent was served.
- The document has not been signed as required by Rule 267(b), SCACR.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Catherine Harrison, deputy".

CLERK

17



The South Carolina Court of Appeals

JENNY ABBOTT KITCHINGS
CLERK

CATHERINE S. HARRISON
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11629
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29211
1220 SENATE STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201
TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1890
FAX: (803) 734-1839
www.sccourts.org

June 11, 2025

Jamie Goss, 00294885
Wateree River Correctional Institution
P. O. Box 189
Rembert SC 29128-0189

Re: The State v. Jamie Goss
Appellate Case No. 2025-001019

Dear Mr. Goss:

This Court has received your notice of appeal, and the case has been assigned the appellate case number that appears above. Please use this number on all future correspondence relating to this matter.

All parties to this matter are advised that all filings must comply with the requirements of Rule 267 of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules (SCACR). The SCACR are available online at www.sccourts.org/courtreg. Additionally, any filings submitted by counsel admitted in South Carolina must include counsel's bar number.

The attention of the parties is directed to the order relating to the inclusion of personal data identifiers and other sensitive information in documents filed with the Supreme Court of South Carolina and the South Carolina Court of Appeals. The order can be found at www.sccourts.org/courtOrders/displayOrder.cfm?orderNo=2014-04-15-02. Please note that the responsibility for insuring that information is redacted or sealed as

required by this order rests with counsel and the parties. This office will *not* review filings for redaction or to determine if materials should be sealed.

This is to advise that the title in the above matter has been changed to read as follows:

The State, Respondent,

v.

Jamie Goss, Appellant.


All future records in this matter should be changed to reflect this title. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact this office.

Very truly yours,

Catherine Hannissal, deputy
CLERK

cc: Nancy R. Livesay, Esquire
Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire
Ronald William Hazzard, Esquire
Robert Michael Dudek, Esquire

cc: Nancy R. Livesay, Esquire
Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire
Ronald William Hazzard, Esquire
Robert Michael Dudek, Esquire



The Supreme Court of South Carolina

PATRICIA A. HOWARD
CLERK OF COURT

BRENDA F. SHEALY
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

POST OFFICE BOX 11330
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA
29211

1231 GERVAIS STREET
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29201

TELEPHONE: (803) 734-1080

FAX: (803) 734-1499

www.sccourts.org

July 15, 2025

Mr. Jamie Goss #294885
Wateree Prison Ward
P. O. Box 189
Rembert, SC 29128

Dear Mr. Goss:

This responds to your letter received July 14, 2025, relating to your case pending at the court of appeals. below. Since you are represented by counsel in this matter(s), no action will be taken on your pro se filing. *Miller v. State*, 388 S.C. 347, 697 S.E.2d 527 (2010); *Jones v. State*, 348 S.C. 13, 558 S.E.2d 517 (2002); *State v. Stuckey*, 333 S.C. 56, 508 S.E.2d 564 (1998); *Foster v. State*, 298 S.C. 298 S.C. 306, 379 S.E.2d 907 (1989).

We are forwarding a copy of your letter to your counsel so they can be aware of your concerns.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Howard

CLERK

cc: Ronald William Hazzard (with copy of correspondence)
Wanda H. Carter (with copy of correspondence)

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings (with copy of correspondence)

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

The State, Respondent,

v.

Jamie Goss, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2025-001019

The Honorable David P. Caraker, Jr.
Horry County
Trial Court Case No. 2006GS2604735

ORDER

Appellant has failed to provide a signed Notice of Appeal, as required by Rule 267(b) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules and as directed by the Court's letters of June 11, 2025 and July 15, 2025. Accordingly, this matter is dismissed. The remittitur will be sent as provided by Rule 221(b), SCACR.

FOR THE COURT

BY



CLERK

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

Jamie Goss, 00294885

Nancy R. Livesay, Esquire

Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire


Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire

Ronald William Hazzard, Esquire

Wanda H. Carter, Esquire

FILED
Jul 29 2025

Jamie Goss 294885
Waterloo Prison
P.O. Box 189
Rembert, S.C. 29126-0189



RECEIVED

AUG 07 2025
SC Court of Appeals

Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitching
Post Office Box 11629
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

