

The South Carolina Court of Appeals

The State, Respondent,

v.

Raekwon Malik Ellerbe, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2023-001563

ORDER

On October 9, 2024, Appellant's appointed counsel filed a brief pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). Thereafter, this court granted Appellant's requests for extensions of time to file his pro se brief. On October 30, 2025, this court received Appellant's pro se brief and his amendment to his pro se brief. On October 16, 2025, Appellant filed a motion to "appoint new counsel on appeal," in which he requested this court (1) vacate the *Anders* brief filed by appellate counsel, (2) appoint "new, independent counsel to represent Appellant," and (3) "[o]rder new counsel to file a full merits brief" on the issues identified in the *Anders* brief, the issues identified in Appellant's pro se brief, and any other meritorious issue. After careful consideration, we deny Appellant's motion. *See State v. Graddick*, 345 S.C. 383, 385-86, 548 S.E.2d 210, 211 (2001) (finding no reversible error in a refusal to relieve counsel based on arguments that counsel was not representing the defendant's interests, counsel was not prepared, and the defendant did "not feel comfortable" with counsel).

Kristi J. Curtis

J.

FOR THE COURT

Columbia, South Carolina

cc:

Raekwon Malik Ellerbe, 00392059

Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire

Melody Jane Brown, Esquire

FILED
Nov 13 2025

Joanna Katherine Delany, Esquire
Paul Michael Burch, Jr., Esquire