

# The South Carolina Court of Appeals

The State, Respondent,

v.

Ray Edward Chestnut, Appellant.

Appellate Case No. 2025-001447

---

## ORDER

---

On February 3, 2026, Appellant moved to relieve his counsel. After careful consideration, we deny Appellant's motion. *See State v. Roberts*, 364 S.C. 583, 588, 614 S.E.2d 626, 629 (2005) (finding "there is no state constitutional provision which confers" a right to proceed pro se on appeal from a criminal conviction).

On March 2, 2026, Appellant filed a motion to file a supplemental pro se response to his counsel's brief filed pursuant to *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). He also conditionally filed his supplemental pro se response. On March 3, 2026, Appellant filed a second motion to file a supplemental pro se response and conditionally filed his second supplemental pro se response. Then, on March 4, 2026, Appellant filed a third motion to file a supplemental response and conditionally filed his third supplemental pro se response. After careful consideration, we grant Appellant's first, second, and third motion to file supplemental pro se responses. We accept Appellant's first, second, and third supplemental pro se responses as filed.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
FOR THE COURT

J.

Columbia, South Carolina

**FILED**  
**Mar 17 2026**

---

cc:

Ray Edward Chestnut, 00304094

Alan McCrory Wilson, Esquire

Mark Reynolds Farthing, Esquire

Wesley Chandler Norville, Esquire

Renee Elvis