

Randolph Ashford *256638
Lee Corr. Inst. F-6, B-2214
990 Wisacky HWY
Bishopville, South Carolina-29010

RECEIVED

JAN 27 2026

SC Court of Appeals

January 22, 2026.

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

Re: The State v. Randolph Ashford
Appellant Case No. 2023-001463

Dear Honorable Clerk:

Enclosed You will find a Copy of the Order that was unintentionally left out of the motion for rehearing that were filed with the Court on December 25, 2025.

Please return the copy to me for my record in this matter.

Thank You very much.

Sincerely,

Randolph Ashford

Enclosures

CC: Attorney General Office
For South Carolina

Certificate of Service

RECEIVED

JAN 27 2026

SC Court of Appeals

Re: The State v. Randolph Ashtford
Appellant Case No. 2023-001463

I do hereby Certify that I have serve the following
Counsels of record the letter, and Order by Placing the
Same in the United States Postal Service with Sufficient
Postage affixed thereto here at the institution mailroom
on the date below.

January 22 2026.

Randolph Ashtford
Randolph Ashtford #256638
Pro-se

Enclosures

CC: South Carolina Court of Appeals
Jenny Abbott Kitchings Clerk of Court
Post Office Box 11629
Columbia, South Carolina-29211

Alan McCrory Wilson / Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esq.
South Carolina Attorney General Office
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, South Carolina-29211-1549



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

December 10, 2025

Randolph Ashford, 00256638
Lee Correctional Inst.
990 Wisacky Highway
Bishopville SC 29010

Mr. Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire
PO Box 11549
Columbia SC 29211-1549

Re: The State v. Randolph Ashford
Appellate Case No. 2023-001463

Dear Counsel and Mr. Ashford:

Enclosed is the decision of the Court. The remittitur will be sent as provided by Rule 221(b) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules.

Very truly yours,

Jasmine D. Smith, Deputy
CLERK

cc: Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Byron E. Gipson, Esquire
The Honorable Robert E. Hood

**THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.**

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals**

The State, Respondent,

v.

Randolph Ashford, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2023-001463

Appeal From Richland County
Robert E. Hood, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2025-UP-402
Submitted November 1, 2025 – Filed December 10, 2025

AFFIRMED

Randolph Ashford, pro se.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Senior
Assistant Deputy Attorney General Mark Reynolds
Farthing, and Solicitor Byron E. Gipson, all of Columbia,
for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Randolph Ashford appeals his convictions for first-degree burglary, two counts of kidnapping, two counts of assault with intent to kill, and three counts of carjacking, along with his aggregate sentence of forty years' imprisonment. On appeal, Ashford argues the trial court abused its discretion by

denying his motion for a new trial based on after-discovered evidence under Rule 29(b) of the South Carolina Rules of Criminal Procedure.¹ We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR.

We hold the trial court did not abuse its discretion by denying Ashford's motion for a new trial because the motion was not timely and Ashford failed to demonstrate any of the factors supporting granting the motion. *See State v. Harris*, 391 S.C. 539, 544-45, 706 S.E.2d 526, 529 (Ct. App. 2011) ("A motion for a new trial based on after-discovered evidence is addressed to the sound discretion of the trial [court]." (quoting *State v. Irvin*, 270 S.C. 539, 545, 243 S.E.2d 195, 197 (1978))); *id.* ("The granting of a new trial because of after-discovered evidence is not favored,' and [appellate courts] will affirm the trial court's denial of such a motion unless the trial court abused its discretion." (quoting *Irvin*, 270 S.C. at 545, 243 S.E.2d at 197-98)); Rule 29(b), SCRCrimP ("A motion for a new trial based on after-discovered evidence must be made within one (1) year after the date of actual discovery of the evidence by the defendant or after the date when the evidence could have been ascertained by the exercise of reasonable diligence."); *State v. Haulcomb*, 260 S.C. 260, 270, 195 S.E.2d 601, 606 (1973) ("[A]fter-discovered evidence refers to evidence of facts existing at [the] time of trial of which [the] aggrieved party was excusably ignorant."); *State v. Spann*, 334 S.C. 618, 619-20, 513 S.E.2d 98, 99 (1999) (explaining a defendant moving for a new trial on the basis of after-discovered evidence must show the evidence (1) would probably change the result if a new trial were granted, (2) has been discovered since the trial, (3) could not have been discovered prior to trial by the exercise of due diligence, (4) is material, and (5) is not merely cumulative or impeaching).

AFFIRMED.²

KONDUROS, GEATHERS, and VINSON, JJ., concur.

¹ On November 17, 2025, Ashford filed a "motion to allow filing of a supplemental record on appeal." We grant Ashford's motion and have considered the supplemental record on appeal.

² We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.

Randolph Ashford #256638
Lee Carr. Inst. F-6. B-2214
990 Wisacky HWY
Bishopville, South Carolina-29010

January 22, 2026.

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

Re: The State v. Randolph Ashford
Appellant Case No. 2023-001463

Dear Honorable Clerk:

Enclosed you will find a copy of the Order that was unintentionally left out of the motion for rehearing that were filed with the Court on December 25, 2025.

Please return the copy to me for my record in this matter.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Randolph Ashford

Enclosures

CC: Attorney General Office
For South Carolina

Certificate of Service

Re: The State v. Randolph Ashtford
Appellant Case No. 2023-001463

I do hereby Certify that I have serve the following
Counsels of record the letter, and Order by Placing the
Same in the United States Postal Service with Sufficient
Postage affixed thereto here at the institution mailroom
on the date below.

January 22, 2026.

Randolph Ashtford
Randolph Ashtford #256638
Pro-se

Enclosures

cc: South Carolina Court of Appeals
Jenny Abbott Kitchings Clerk of Court
Post Office Box 11629
Columbia, South Carolina-29211

Alan McCrory Wilson / Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esq.
South Carolina Attorney General Office
Post Office Box 11549
Columbia, South Carolina-29211-1549



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

December 10, 2025

Randolph Ashford, 00256638
Lee Correctional Inst.
990 Wisacky Highway
Bishopville SC 29010

Mr. Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire
PO Box 11549
Columbia SC 29211-1549

Re: The State v. Randolph Ashford
Appellate Case No. 2023-001463

Dear Counsel and Mr. Ashford:

Enclosed is the decision of the Court. The remittitur will be sent as provided by Rule 221(b) of the South Carolina Appellate Court Rules.

Very truly yours,

Jasmine J. Smith, Deputy
CLERK

cc: Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire
Byron E. Gipson, Esquire
The Honorable Robert E. Hood

**THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.**

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals**

The State, Respondent,

v.

Randolph Ashford, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2023-001463

Appeal From Richland County
Robert E. Hood, Circuit Court Judge

Unpublished Opinion No. 2025-UP-402
Submitted November 1, 2025 – Filed December 10, 2025

AFFIRMED

Randolph Ashford, pro se.

Attorney General Alan McCrory Wilson, Senior
Assistant Deputy Attorney General Mark Reynolds
Farthing, and Solicitor Byron E. Gipson, all of Columbia,
for Respondent.

PER CURIAM: Randolph Ashford appeals his convictions for first-degree burglary, two counts of kidnapping, two counts of assault with intent to kill, and three counts of carjacking, along with his aggregate sentence of forty years' imprisonment. On appeal, Ashford argues the trial court abused its discretion by

denying his motion for a new trial based on after-discovered evidence under Rule 29(b) of the South Carolina Rules of Criminal Procedure.¹ We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR.

We hold the trial court did not abuse its discretion by denying Ashford's motion for a new trial because the motion was not timely and Ashford failed to demonstrate any of the factors supporting granting the motion. *See State v. Harris*, 391 S.C. 539, 544-45, 706 S.E.2d 526, 529 (Ct. App. 2011) ("A motion for a new trial based on after-discovered evidence is addressed to the sound discretion of the trial [court]." (quoting *State v. Irvin*, 270 S.C. 539, 545, 243 S.E.2d 195, 197 (1978))); *id.* ("The granting of a new trial because of after-discovered evidence is not favored,' and [appellate courts] will affirm the trial court's denial of such a motion unless the trial court abused its discretion." (quoting *Irvin*, 270 S.C. at 545, 243 S.E.2d at 197-98)); Rule 29(b), SCRCrimP ("A motion for a new trial based on after-discovered evidence must be made within one (1) year after the date of actual discovery of the evidence by the defendant or after the date when the evidence could have been ascertained by the exercise of reasonable diligence."); *State v. Haulcomb*, 260 S.C. 260, 270, 195 S.E.2d 601, 606 (1973) ("[A]fter-discovered evidence refers to evidence of facts existing at [the] time of trial of which [the] aggrieved party was excusably ignorant."); *State v. Spann*, 334 S.C. 618, 619-20, 513 S.E.2d 98, 99 (1999) (explaining a defendant moving for a new trial on the basis of after-discovered evidence must show the evidence (1) would probably change the result if a new trial were granted, (2) has been discovered since the trial, (3) could not have been discovered prior to trial by the exercise of due diligence, (4) is material, and (5) is not merely cumulative or impeaching).

AFFIRMED.²

KONDUROS, GEATHERS, and VINSON, JJ., concur.

¹ On November 17, 2025, Ashford filed a "motion to allow filing of a supplemental record on appeal." We grant Ashford's motion and have considered the supplemental record on appeal.

² We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to Rule 215, SCACR.

Randolph Ashford # 256638
Lee Corr. Inst. F-6, B-2214
990 Wisacky Hwy
Bishopville, South Carolina-29010

LEE CLINMATE
COLUMBIA SC 290

22 JAN 2026 PM 2 L



US POSTAGE PAID PITNEY BOWES



ZIP 29010 \$001.03⁰
02 4W
0000373846 JAN 22 2026

RECEIVED

JAN 27 2026

RECEIVED SC Court of Appeals

JAN 22 2026

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

LEE CI MAIL ROOM

LEGAL MAIL ONLY

29211-162929

