

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SUPREME COURT

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2026

SC Court of Appeals

Appeal From Richland County
Court of General Sessions
Honorable Robert E. Hood, Circuit Court Judge

Case No. 2023-001463

State of South Carolina, _____ Respondent,

v.

Randolph Ashford, _____ Appellant.

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Randolph Ashford #256638
Lee Correctional Institution
990 Wisacky HWY
Bishopville, South Carolina-29010
Pro-se

Attorney General Office For S. C.
Alan McCrory Wilson/Mark Reynolds Farthing Esq.
P.O. Box 11549
Columbia, South Carolina-29211-1549

INDEX

Certificate of Counsel _____ ... 2

Questions Presented _____ ... 2

Statement of the Case _____ 34

Argument _____ 5678

I. Did the Court abuse its discretion where Substantial Due Process violations issues was directly involved in admitting the Crime Scene contaminated Evidence?

II. Did the Court abuse its discretion where Substantial Due Process violations issues was directly involved in (9) nine Void, null, Fabricated indictment?

Conclusion _____ 8

Certificate of Service _____

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

Pro se Appellant, Randolph Ashford, certifies that the Petition For Rehearing was made and finally ruled upon by the Court of appeals on January 29, 2026.

Questions Presented

1. Did the Court abuse its discretion, where Substantial Due Process violations issues was directly involved in admitting the Crime Scene Contaminated Evidence? .
2. Did the Court abuse its discretion, where Substantial Due Process issues was directly involved in (9) nine void, null Fabricated indictments? .

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On February 24, 2007, Appellant Randolph Ashford, was arrested by Richland County Sheriff's Office and charged with 1st degree burglary, Two Counts of Kidnapping, One Count of 1st degree Criminal Sexual Conduct, Three Counts of Carjacking, and Two Counts of Assault with intent to Kill.

During the April and May term the Richland County Clerk of Court, falsified the alleged (9) nine indictments claiming the Richland County Grand Jury indicted Appellant of all nine Criminal Charges.¹ On March 30, 2009, through April 3, 2009, Appellant proceeded with a jury trial in the Richland County Court of General Sessions before the Honorable G. Thomas Cooper.

At the conclusion of the trial the Jury found Appellant guilty of the void, null, unlawful, fabricated indictment's ex-1st degree Criminal Sexual Conduct². As to that fabricated indictment 2007-65-40-1940, the Court charged a lesser included offense of assault and battery of a high and aggravated nature. Following the verdict, the trial Court Judge sentenced Appellant to a (40) forty year term imprisonment.

Following a unsuccessful direct appeal, Post Conviction Relief, and other unsuccessful attempts to obtain relief, Appellant

1. Oddly Appellant Randolph Ashford, (9) nine indictments was filed with the Richland County Clerk of Court, Pursuant to the South Carolina Rules of Court, Rule - 3 (c) Action on Warrant, September 12, 2025, Approximately (18) Eighteen years later.

2. Thursday April 2, 2009, Trial Transcript, Page = 663, lines-14-19, The Court: I understand, the question is based on that statement, would it support a charge of assault and battery of a high and aggravated nature,
Solicitor: No Sir,

filed a Pro-se Motion For New Trial Based on After-Discovered Evidence on January 31, 2023, On or about August 16, 2023, The State of South Carolina filed a return/response that OPPOSE Appellant's motion, and requested the matter be dismissed with Prejudice and remove from the Non-Jury motion hearing docket. At this Point, Appellant had not been Properly served with a copy of the order,³ nor proper written notice of such. Appellant filed a Pro-se response opposing the States return.

The Court of Appeals affirmed the Judgment of the Court The State v. Randolph Ashford, Appellate Case No. 2023-001463 OP. No. 2025-UP-402, Submitted November 1, 2025, - Filed Dec 10, 2025.

The Petitioner seeks a Writ of Certiorari to review this decision.

³ The Court addressed the unusual nature of how Appellant Randolph Ashford Current appeal was initiated through its November 13, 2023, Order. See: record on Appeal Page 6 and 7.

ARGUMENT

The South Carolina Court of Appeals Should have held that, the trial Court abused its discretion where Substantial Constitutional issues was directly involved, resulting in Ashford, being denied his rights to Due Process of law, and his rights to a fair trial.

On March 30, 2009 through April 3, 2009, Appellant Randolph Ashford, Proceeded to trial before the Honorable Judge Cooper; On April 2, 2009, Crime Scene Investigator Patrica Reed Enzor; testified under oath that she secured the Crime scene by placing a deputy on the scene over night, and that was a lie, then Patrica Reed Enzor, testified on cross examination that she had release the Crime scene to the brother Ali Harrison of the residents. See: Original Trial Transcript Pages - 615 through 638, Lines 1-25 also SUPP. R. Pages 492 through P. 515, Lines 1-25; Giglio v. U.S. 405 US 150, 153, 92 S.Ct. 763, 31 L.Ed 104 (1972).⁴ The Court was fully aware of the contaminated crime scene evidence.⁵ See: April 3, 2009, Trial Transcript, Pages 669 through 672, Lines 1-25, Rule-501, SCACR Code of Judicial Conduct Canon-3. (B. (3), (4), (5), Violating Appellant's right to a fair trial. Washington v. State, S.C. 232, 478, S.E. 2d 833 (1996) Thu due Process violations occurs

4 The Honorable G. Thomas Cooper; April 3, 2009, Trial Transcript Page- 926, Lines -20-25, I am not permitted to indicate to you how I might feel about the facts.

5 The Honorable G. Thomas Cooper; April 3, 2009, Trial Transcript, Page- 930 Lines 1-6, Now generally there are two types of evidence which has been described to you that are generally presented during a trial, direct evidence and circumstantial evidence-- and we probably had both in this case.

when law enforcement officer who participated in the investigation or preparation of the prosecution's case fabricates evidence or give false testimony against the defendant/ Appellant at trial on an issue material to guilt or innocence, A conviction is tainted and must be set aside if there is any reasonable likelihood that the false evidence could have -- affected the Jurys verdict.⁶ April 2, 2009, Trial Transcript, P. 665, through 668, Lines - 1-25, McCoy v. State, 401 S.C. 363 737 S.E. 2d 623 (2013).

April 3, 2009, Nicole Singletary, Assistant Public Defender Trial Transcript Page 858 through 862, Lines 1-25. Ms. Singletary: Yes, Your Honor. At this time the defense would respectfully make a motion for a mistrial based on due Process violations and 403, Your Honor.⁷ April 3, 2009, Trial Transcript, Page- 15-16, Lines - 3-25; Mr. O'Neil: Yes, Your Honor, at this time I would like to renew all our previous objections and motions specifically but not limited to my direct verdict motion as relates to AWIKs, the kidnaping, and carjacking, And I also at this time would make a motion for New trial based on the due Process violations dealing with the outburst during Jury selection, and also the outburst -- In criminal cases, the appellant Court sit to review error of law only," State v. Edwards, 373 S.C. 230 644 S.E. 2d 661 (March 12, 2007) This same standard of review--

6 April 2, 2009, Trial Transcript, Page-665, Lines-3-7. MR. O'Neil: Yes, Your Honor, I think it came to the state's attention on yesterday that one of their deputies a deputy White from Richland County Sheriff's Department; may have overheard I think it was what turned out to be juror number 134 during lunch saying something to the effect that "I've heard all I need to hear."

7 April 2, 2009, Trial Transcript, Page 479, Lines - 13-14, The Court: Just hold it. Mr. Broome, You all hold it down, please. SUPP. R. P. 479, Lines - 13-14.

applies to preliminary factual findings in determining the admissibility of certain evidence in criminal cases.

The South Carolina Court of Appeals should hold that the trial court abused its discretion where substantial due process violations issues was directly involved in (9) nine void, null, fabricated indictments.

Appellant had a constitutional and statutory right to have the (9) nine indictments issued by a legally constituted grand jury. South Carolina Constitution, Article I and 3 and Article V, 22; and South Carolina Code Ann-14-9-210, and other statutes.

Rule 3. SCRCrimP

Rule 3. Disposition of Arrest Warrants

(c) Action on warrant

Within ninety (90) days after receipt of an arrest warrant from the clerk of court, the solicitor shall take action on the warrant by (1) preparing an indictment for presentment to the grand jury, which indictment shall be filed with the clerk of court, assigned a criminal case number, and presented to the grand jury etc.

Here Appellant will show unto the Supreme Court of South Carolina, all of the alleged (9) nine indictments is void, null, and fabricated. See: SUPP. R. P. 775 through 791, also See: Appellant November 17, 2025, Ashford's motion to allow filing of a supplemental record on appeal, Indictments-

filed September 12, 2025. (18) Years later, S.C. Const Art.

1 § 12

CONCLUSION

For the Substantial Due Process violations, Petitioner ask the Court to grant the Petition for Writ of Certiorari

February 19 2026.

Respectfully Submitted

Randolph Ashford

Randolph Ashford # 256638

Lee Corr. Inst. F-6, B-2214

990 Wiszcky Hwy

Bishopville, South Carolina-

29010

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2026

SC Court of Appeals

I do hereby Certify that I have serve the following
Counsels of Record the original and Copies of the Petition
For Writ of Certiorari by Placing the Same in the United
States mail with Sufficient Postage affixed thereto here
at the institution mailroom.

Date: February 19 2026.

Randolph Ashford
Randolph Ashford #256638
Pro-se

Enclosures

cc: South Carolina Supreme Court
Post Office Box 11330
Columbia, South Carolina-29211

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

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

February 19, 2026.

RECEIVED

FEB 25 2026

SC Court of Appeals

The Supreme Court of South Carolina
Post office Box 11330
Columbia, South Carolina - 29211

Re: Petition For Writ of Certiorari
State v. Randolph Ashford, Appellate Case No. 2023-001463

Dear Honorable Clerk:

Enclosed you will find the original Pro se Petition For Writ of Certiorari, and Appendix for your filing. Note: I am unable to refer to the State/Respondent's Supplemental Record on Appeal, due to the State/Respondent's only transcribed portions of the record that best suit their position.

Therefore I will refer to the original Trial Transcript of Record dated March 30, 2009 through April 3, 2009.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Randolph Ashford

Enclosures

CC: The Supreme Court of South Carolina
The South Carolina Court of Appeals
The South Carolina Attorney General Office

Randolph Ashford # 256638
Lee Corr. Inst. F6, B-2214
990 Wisacky Hwy
Bishopville, South Carolina-29010

South Carolina Court of Appeals
Jenny Abott Kitchinas, Clerk of Court
Post Office Box 11629
Columbia, South Carolina-29211

RECEIVED
FEB 20 2026
LEE CI MAIL ROOM