



RECEIVED

Nov 13 2025

SC Court of Appeals

ALAN WILSON
ATTORNEY GENERAL

November 13, 2025

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings
Clerk of Court, South Carolina Court of Appeals
Post Office Box 11629
Columbia, South Carolina 29211

Re: State v. Juan Manuel Ramirez Sandoval -- Appellate Case No. 2023-000590

Dear Ms. Kitchings:

Yesterday, this Court held an oral argument in the above-referenced criminal appeal, and, during that argument, the State referenced several decisions which were not referenced in the appellate briefs. Pursuant to Rule 208(b)(7) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules, the State seeks to provide the Court with supplemental citations to the cases referenced by the State during the oral argument based on the belief the citations will be relevant and helpful to the Court in resolving the appeal. Specifically, the State believes the following citations may be relevant to the issue raised on appeal: See State v. Kanneh, 944 A.2d 516 (Md. 2008) (“[A] delay caused by the unavailability of an interpreter does not weigh heavily against the State.”); State v. Cham, 680 N.W.2d 121 (Minn. Ct. App. 2004) (finding the on-going problem of obtaining an interpreter despite the efforts of a court administrator resulted in delay that “the state was in no way responsible for” and, thus, “the reason for delay weighs in favor of the state”); State v. Reynolds, 95 A.3d 973 (Vt. 2014) (“While the responsibility for providing adequate interpretation services lies with the government, this delay was for neutral reasons and does not weigh in the defendant’s favor.”).

Sincerely,

Mark R. Farthing
Senior Assistant Deputy Attorney General
S.C. Bar No. 76901

MRF/

cc: Lara M. Caudy, Esquire
Victim Advocacy Division